

THE
CHURCH of ENGLAND
VINDICATED
FROM

The Charge of ARMINIANISM;

AND

The CASE of ARMINIAN SUBSCRIPTION

particularly considered :

IN

A LETTER to the Rev. Dr. NOWELL.

OCCASIONED BY

Some Passages in that Gentleman's ANSWER to the
Author of PIETAS OXONIENSIS.

By AUGUSTUS TOPLADY, A.B.
Late VICAR of BROAD-HEMBURY, DEVON.

“ Ità veritati litabo, ne pacem turbem : ità pacem colam, ut nullo
“ tamen eam veritatis dispendio redemptam velim.”

WITSIUS, in Orat. de vero Theol.

“ To be IMPUGNED from without, and BETRAYED from within,
“ is certainly the worst Condition a Church can fall into.

Dr. SOUTH.

THE SECOND EDITION,
From a Copy corrected and enlarged by the Author.

L O N D O N :

PRINTED FOR JAMES MATHEWS, N^o 18, STRAND.
M.DCC.LXXIX.

[2/6]

THE
CHURCHMAN
VOLUME 1
THE CHURCH OF ARMENIANS

47
8 13
985.



AUGUSTUS TOWARD A B

THE CHURCH OF ARMENIANS

LONDON

PRINTED BY JAMES HARRISON, N. 15, ST. MARK'S PLACE, E.C. 4.

T H E
CHURCH of ENGLAND vindicated, &c.

REVEREND SIR,

HAPPENING to call on a friend of mine, in *Westminster*, yesterday evening, December 28th; I found him reading your late letter to the author of *Pietas Oxoniensis*. Curiosity naturally induced me to look into your pamphlet: and grieved I was, to find, that a person in your eminent station, and of your distinguished abilities, should so far lose sight of the duty you owe to that excellent church which you would seem to defend; as to brand, for *methodistical* tenets, some of those capital truths, which were the avowed doctrines of our reformers; and which, at this very day, make so distinguished a figure in the unrepealed standards of our national faith.

To vindicate the best of visible churches, from the false charge of *Arminianism*, fastened on her by you; and to prove, that the principles commonly (although, perhaps, not so properly) termed *Calvinistic*, are *plainly* and *repeatedly* delivered in the authentic declarations of her belief; were the reasons that chiefly induced me to resolve on the present undertaking. In consequence of which resolution, I took home your pamphlet with me, and have it now before me.

I would premise, that the two grand questions, on which I shall join issue with you, are, 1st, Not so much whether the Calvinistic doctrines are right or wrong *in themselves*; as, whether they are, or are not, the doctrines of *the church of England*: and, 2. Whether, on proof of their actually being the doctrines of our

A 2

church,

church Arminians can, with a safe conscience, and *bonâ fide*, SUBSCRIBE to those doctrines *ex animo*.

As to the affair of the *expulsion*, I shall enter very little into the merits of that; as not directly falling in with my main design. The injustice, whether real or supposed, shewn to those young men, is of very little consequence, when set in competition with the open attack, which you, Sir, under the habit of a friend, have ventured to make on *the church herself*. If it be true, that the persons, expelled, were so treated *merely* for incapacity, and for holding what either the law or the university statutes deem illicit conventicles; it would indeed follow, that the hardship, so generally complained of, was not so great, as it might seem at first view. Every society, as such, have, no doubt, an intrinsic right to agree upon such reasonable and lawful rules, as they may deem necessary for their own interior government and regulation. And, by virtue of that same right, they may expel such of their members, as refuse to adjust their conduct by the rules so enacted. Yet as *excommunication** is the *dernier ressource* of a church, and takes place, not until all milder expedients, for the reformation of the offending party, have been tried without effect; so should *expulsion* from any other society. How far this equitable rule was observed lately at *Oxford*, is a circumstance not yet cleared up by *the assessors*: and, until it is, the public are certainly at liberty to form what judgment they can from *appearances*.

It has been affirmed, by some who ought to know, that the pretence of illiteracy and irregularity, in the parties expelled, was only adopted by way of casting a mist before the eyes of the world: while, in fact, the true reason of their expulsion was, their attachment to the doctrines of *predestination unto life, regeneration by the Spirit of God, and justification by faith alone*. If this

* By our law, sentence of excommunication is not to be pronounced, until after *public admonition* THREE given, with the interval of at least *two days* BETWEEN each admonition.

was the real cause of that transaction, the young men were *persecuted*, to all intents and purposes; and are to be equally pitied and respected: *pitied*, for the oppressive treatment they meet with; *respected*, for their firmness in adhering to doctrines which they believe to be true, and which, whether true or not, are the undoubted doctrines of the church established. —Add to this, that, *if* some persons, *equally or more illiterate*, and *IRREGULAR in a much worse sense*, continue still unmolested members of this very university; all unprejudiced spectators will cry out,

Dat veniam corvis, vexat censura columbas.

I am not certain, much less dare I to affirm, that the public have hit upon the true cause of this remarkable expulsion. If they have (and even the account given by yourself, seems to justify the general belief), we may now, with the utmost truth, adopt the old cry of “The church is in danger.”* Since, for a considerable number of the most eminent persons belonging to one of the most respectable universities in *Europe*, to sit in judgment on six of their own body, and pass sentence of condemnation upon them, for believing and asserting the leading truths of that very church with which the *expellers*, no less than the *expelled*, profess to agree; is, *mutatis mutandis*, as if a Romish council should anathematize *six Papists* for holding transubstantiation; or a Scotch synod should excommunicate *six Presbyterians*, for maintaining a parity among the clergy to be more apostolical than episcopacy. For, gratuitous predestination, justification by faith only, and the efficacy of divine grace in regeneration, are, as palpably, asserted by the church of England; as *transubstantiation* is by the church of Rome, or *parity of ministers* by the church of Scotland.

Before I enter on the proof of this, I must clear my way, by first considering what *you*, Sir, alledge on the

* How strangely are times altered in Oxford, since Usher preached there! See the preface to his Sermons in *Quarto*.

other side. In doing which, I shall endeavour to preserve, not only the decency, but the respect, to which your merits, both as a scholar and as a writer, justly entitle you. Though fame is mistaken, if you have not condescended to act as a *secretary*, on *this*, as well as a preceding occasion. However this be, I cannot help wishing, that so worthy and considerable a person had drawn his pen, rather in attempting to *heal*, than *widen*, the unhappy breaches among us; and had undertaken to *vindicate*, instead of seeking to *confute*, the doctrines of the church he professes to revere. But, alas! every day's experience proves the truth of the old adage; "All is not wise, that wise men say; nor all good, that good men do."

Now, Sir, to the point. With regard to the doctrines in debate between Calvinists and Arminians, you ingenuously confess, that they are matters, which "wise and good men have always differed about," page 69. I applaud your *justice*, in granting that Calvinists, no less than Arminians, may be "*wise and good men*;" but I cannot say, I admire the want of *precision*, with which you express yourself. Wise and good men did not *always* differ about those points. There is, on the contrary, the utmost reason to believe, that *the main body of the Christian church* (in which I do not include the *Arians* of those times) were unanimous believers of the doctrines now termed Calvinistic, for *the four first centuries*: until, at the opening of the *fifth*, a Welsh monk, known by the assumed name of *Pelagius*, struck out a new path of his own, and laid out the foundations of that mystery of iniquity, which has, more or less, been working ever since.

I am aware, that some Arminian writers, both English and Foreign, have had the assurance (somewhat like the Papists on another occasion) to ask, "Where was the doctrine of predestination before St. *Austin*?" To which I answer, in my turn, Where was *not* the doctrine of predestination before *Pelagius*? That his opinions, concerning the slight effects of original

ginal sin, the power of man's free will, and the possibility of human merit, were NOVEL and unheard-of until then ; appears, among other circumstances, from the *surprise* and *horror*, with which they were received by the universal church. A valuable historian, of our own, tells us, and tells us truly, that " To recount
 " the learned works of *fathers* written ; their pious
 " *sermons* preached ; passionate [i. e. pathetic] *epistles*
 " sent ; private *conferences* entertained ; public *dispu-*
 " *tations* held ; provincial *synods* summoned ; *general*
 " *councils* called ; wholesome *canons* made, to con-
 " fute and condemn these opinions, under the name
 " of *Pelagius*, or his scholar *Cælestius* ; would amount
 " to a volume fitter for a porter's back to bear, than
 " a scholar's brains to peruse." [Fuller, Church Hist. Cent. V. p. 28.]

The learned Dr. *Cave*, whom no one will suspect of being a factor for Calvinism, tells us plainly, that Pelagius "*Hæresin novam condidit,*" was the founder of a NEW heresy. [Hist. Lit. tom. i. ann. 405.] which is as good as to say, that the Christian church were, until that time, in undisturbed possession of the doctrines of Grace. The same great man lets us know what the substance of this new heresy was. "*Peccatum originale funditus sustulit ; docens, Adami peccatum sol-
 " boli ejus non imputari. Homines, plerosque saltem,
 " non gratiæ divinæ beneficio, sed propter operum
 " suorum merita, justificari, & ad vitam æternam præ-
 " destinari, contendit :*" He [i. e. Pelagius] took away original sin from its very foundations, by asserting, that Adam's transgression is NOT IMPUTED to his posterity: and insisted, that men, or, however, the greater part of them, are justified, and predestinated to eternal life, not by the favour of divine grace, but for the worthiness of their own works. Now if the non-imputation of Adam's offence, and the doctrines of justification and predestination as founded on, and resulting from, human worthiness, were parts of the NEW HERESY, it follows, that the opposite doctrines of Adam's transgression imputed

to his offspring, and justification and predestination by grace alone, must have been branches of the old faith universally held by the church, for the first 400 years after Christ.

That consummate scholar and historian, *Spanhemius* the son, treating of *Pelagius* and his tenets, observes, that this Arch-Heretic asserted, "*Causam predestinationis ad gratiam & gloriam esse prævisionem bonorum operum, & perseverantiam in illis, ex recto liberi arbitrii usu, exceptâ tamen gratiâ apostolatûs. Prædestinationem ad mortem nullam dari; solam dari præscientiam peccatorum.*" [Introduct. ad Hist. & Antiq. Sacr. pag. 454.] i. e. that "*The cause of predestination to grace and glory was, the FORESIGHT of good works, and of PERSEVERANCE therein, resulting from a right use of our freewill: and that there is no such thing as predestination unto death; but only a foreknowledge of what sins men would commit.*" That these are the doctrines of the *Arminians* now, as they were of *Pelagius* then, needs no proof. An *Arminian* laughs at the *Imputation* of Adam's offence, in order to elude the necessity of the Messiah's imputed righteousness: He affirms, that we are not justified without works of our own; and that, if there be any such thing as predestination at all, it is founded on the divine foresight of certain conditions and qualifications in the persons predestinated: that *man's will* has the casting vote in the affair of regeneration: and that as he may, to-day, consent to be a child of God; so, to-morrow, he may, by virtue of the same om-

* If the reader has a mind to see a compendious, but very satisfactory account of the first rise and progress of *Arminianism* in *Holland* (from whence the contagion spread into *England*) about the year 1600; he may consult a very valuable treatise, written by the same learned foreigner, entitled, *Controversiarum cum Dissidentibus Hodie Christianis, prolixè & cum Judæis, Elenchus Historico-Theologicus*. Which, in the compass of a moderate 12mo, traces back all the controversies, which now divide the religious world, to their original sources; gives the quintessence of the arguments urged on either side: and, by a judicious mixture of history with divinity, is, perhaps, the most instructive and entertaining piece of general Polemics, hitherto extant. There is brevity, without obscurity; and fulness, without redundancy: nor could that excellent performance be either enlarged, or retrenched, without detracting from its worth.

nipotent

nipotent free-will, undo all, and commence a child of the devil again. Who sees not, that Arminianism is the old Pelagian trump turned up anew? and that the doctrines of conditional grace and precarious salvation, which now go down so glib with many; are the very things, which, at their first appearance, frightened the primitive churches, more than a general persecution would have done? It may further be asked; would an Arminian have drawn up the XVIIth Article?

You yourself, Sir, seem to have been aware of your mistake, in asserting, so peremptorily, that predestination and its concomitant doctrines are points concerning which "*wise and good men have always differed*:" since you presently add, that they "*have been disputed in ALMOST all ages of the Christian church*." During the four first ages of it, they were *undisputed*, for ought appears to the contrary: but, from the time Pelagius first broke the ice, quite down to the reformation, they certainly were frequent subjects of controversy. The reformers, and reformed churches, both here and abroad, were universally on the side of absolute grace, in contradistinction, both to the pretended *merits*, and the boasted *free-agency*, of man. Witness the authentic and valuable collection of articles and confessions of faith, published by *Gasper Laurentius*, in 1612. With regard to *our own* reformers in particular, bishop Burnet, though far enough from warping to Calvinism, is yet so honest as to allow, that, "*In England the first reformers were generally in the* SUBLAPSARIAN *way*:" plainly enough intimating, that *all* our first reformers were doctrinal Calvinists, though with some slight variation; the major part of them being *Sublapsarians*, or holding that God, in the decree of predestination, considered mankind as fallen: the rest of the first reformers having been *Supralapsarians*, who suppose that men were, in that decree, considered neither as fallen nor as unfallen, but simply *as men*, in *puris naturalibus*. A metaphysical disquisition, which still obtains among the anti-Ar-

* On the 17th Art. p. 127, 8vo. edit.

minians;

minians; but which affects not the main question, and concerning which they ever did and do still agree.

I shall, at present, Sir, trouble you with but one more citation from Burnet: a short one indeed it is, but full to the point. You'll find it in that learned and worthy prelate's abridgment of his history of the Reformation, sub ann. 1549. His words are these: "*Another sort of people was much complained of, who built so much on THE RECEIVED OPINION OF PREDESTINATION, that they thought they might live as they pleased.*" Whether or no these people really drew this consequence from the doctrine (as there is nothing so holy as to be exempt from all possibility of abuse;) or whether, as is most probable, it was a slander fastened on them by the disguised Papists of that time; affects not the present argument. The passage proves what I quote it for: namely, that, at the settlement of the reformation, and when the church of England was in her primitive purity, PREDESTINATION *was the RECEIVED OPINION*. Nor, indeed, need the Bishop have told us so. The *articles of religion*, published about a year and a half after the time he speaks of, put the point beyond all doubt. Thus stood this matter in the reign of King *Edward*. We shall come to that of Queen *Elizabeth* by and by. In the mean while,

From *England*, Sir, I follow you to the continent. You are pleased to tell us, p. 69, 70. that these doctrines have been disputed "*Among the Papists, between the Thomists and the Scotists; the Dominicans and the Franciscans:*" to which you might also have added, "*and between the Jansenists and Jesuits.*" I grant it all. And these points not only *have* been, but *are* disputed among them, with abundance of acrimony, to this very day. A most pregnant proof, by the bye, of the *infalibility* and *Catholic unity*, which that most depraved and most impudent of all churches affects to value herself upon.—Had you stopped here, you had done well: but you add, that the doctrines, in debate between yourself and the author of *Pietas Oxoniensis*, were likewise disputed

disputed “ *among the Protestants, from the first beginning of the reformation, between the Lutherans and the Calvinists.*” Here, I apprehend, you have shot beyond the mark. The æra, or *first beginning* of the reformation, is universally, and very justly, assigned to the year 1517, when *Luther* first publicly opposed the sale of the pope’s indulgences at *Wittenberg*. At this time, *Calvin* could have had no followers; for he himself was then a boy of but eight years old; being * born July 10, 1509. Neither was he settled to purpose at *Geneva*, until the year 1541, i. e. five years before the death of *Luther*: by which time the reformation had spread wide and taken deep root on the continent. Hence it is evident, that there were and could have been no disputes, concerning the decrees of God, “ *between the Lutherans and Calvinists, FROM THE FIRST BEGINNING of the reformation:*” for, the reformation was *begun* in *Calvin*’s childhood, long enough before he was brought on the stage of public observation.

The plain truth is, *Luther* himself was *an absolute predestinarian*; and was as able and as resolute a defender of God’s eternal, irrespective decrees, as *Calvin* or any other. So that even had these two great men been as strictly *co-ætanei*, as they were *con-temporaries*, there would have been no room for dissention between them on *that* subject. Bishop *Burnet*, with all his byas to Arminianism, was too well read, not to know; and too honest, not to acknowledge the Calvinism (if it *must* be called by that name) of *Luther*: though the bishop’s aversion to these doctrines made him, very disingenuously, insinuate as if that eminent reformer adopted them, partly, to serve a turn, and, partly, without due examination. “ *When Luther,*” says he, “ *began to form his opinions into a body, he clearly saw,*” “ *that nothing did so plainly destroy the doctrine of merit,*” “ *and justification by works, as St. Austin’s opinions. He*

* Melch. Ad. in *Vita Calvini*, p. 63.

“ found

“ found also in his works very express authorities against
 “ most of the corruptions of the Roman church : and being
 “ of an order that carried his name, and, by consequence,
 “ accustomed to read and reverence his works ; it was no
 “ wonder, if he, without a strict examining of the matter,
 “ espoused all his [Austin's] opinions,” [on Art. 17.
 p. 194.] However, not to rest on mere testimony,
 which, at best, is but evidence at second hand ; as a
 solid and indisputable proof that I go on sure grounds
 in averring Luther to have held absolute predestination,
 I appeal to the memorable controversy between him
 and *Erasmus*. The latter had, at the importunate and
 repeated requests of king *Henry VIII.* and cardinal
Wolsey, published a treatise in favour of *free-will*,
 wherein Luther was severely reflected on for holding
 the opposite doctrine. To this Luther published a
 copious answer ; drawn up in a very nervous manner,
 and with a vast compass of argument ; entitling it,
De Servo Arbitrio, or, *The Human Will a Slave*. If
 any person, after having read a single chapter in that
 masterly performance, has the assurance to pronounce
 Luther an enemy to what is now known by the name
 of *Doctrinal Calvinism* ; * he may, when his hand is in,
 call *Baronius* a Protestant, or affirm *Calvin* himself to
 have been an Arminian. It was chiefly from this book
 of Luther's, on *The Servitude of the Will*, that those six
 positions against free-agency were picked out, which,
 twenty years afterwards, made such a bustle in the coun-
 cil of *Trent*, and were agitated with so much heat and di-
 vision by the infallible church : some siding with Luther,
 and declaring that he had asserted no more than *Austin*
 had done before him ; others anathematizing the posi-
 tions, as the very quintessence of heresy, and of most
 dangerous consequence to the Catholic Faith. The lat-
 ter party carried their point : and accordingly the 4th,
 5th, and 6th canons, passed in the 6th session of that in-

* See *Heylin's Life of Laud*, p. 32.

famous council, are directly pointed against the decisions of Luther respecting the inability of man's will. *

The followers of Luther and Calvin, *since † the deaths* of those great reformers (for I cannot find that they did it before), have, if you please, not only differed, but fallen out, with relation to some (and only some) of the points you speak of: but not those reformers themselves. Had they agreed as well about *the nature of the Lord's supper*, as they did about predestination, justification, and perseverance; the two denominations of Lutherans and Calvinists, had been, in fact, one and the same; so far, at least, as matters of doctrine are concerned.

Page 70, you put this question to the author of *Pietas*; "*What pretence have you to call your own notions the principles of the reformation?*" Because they are so. Open the Liturgy where you will, Calvinism stares you in the face. And can the doctrines of grace enter into the very basis of a reformed church, yet not be principles of the reformation? — You ask likewise, Why he calls "*the contrary opinions, the avowed tenets of the church of Rome?*" Because the very letter of scripture bids us *render to All their dues*. The Arminian tenets *belong* to the church of Rome. Her's they are, and to her they should be returned. From her they came, and to her they lead. It matters not, that there were a few such persons, as *Marinier, De Vega, and Catanea*, in the council of Trent; nor that there are still some individuals within the Romish pale (the Jansenists, for instance), who believe the doctrines of predestination and invincible grace, as taught by St. Paul and St. Austin; and, from these, by Calvin and the reformed churches.

Quid te exempta juvat spinis de pluribus una?

* Of forty-two Propositions of *Luther*, condemned by the Pope, A. D. 1521, this is the 37th, "Free-will, after Sin, is a thing
" De Solo Titulo: and while it doth what in it is, it sinneth
" mortally." Strype's *Eccl. Mem.* V. i. 39.

† See *Tindal*, V. 15, 273.

The point is, How goes the stream? quite in the contrary channel. Witness the *Tridentine* decisions, and the more recent constitution *Unigenitus*. Let a man peruse *these*, and then doubt, if he can, whether *Arminianism* does not cordially coincide with *Popery*.

But you urge, that the Arminian doctrines “ have been maintained by many of the brightest ornaments of our church: such as *Laud*, *Hammond*, *Bull*, &c.” I except against *Laud*. I cannot allow him, upon the whole, to have been any ornament to us at all: much less can I put him at the head of our *brightest* ornaments. If he had any *brightness* belonging to him, it was the brightness of a *fire-brand*, which, at the long run, set both church and state in a flame. Learned as he was (or, rather, an encourager of learning in others, so they were not Calvinists,) he was, at best, but a mongrel-protestant; and would have but acted consistently with himself, had he accepted the *cardinal's hat*, which was offered him from *Rome*. So declared an enemy was your *bright ornament*, to all liberty, both civil and religious, that I make no scruple to call him a disgrace to his order, to his country, and to human nature. Illegal and unwarrantable, in itself, as his execution was; yet his life, written by his creature *Heylin*, on purpose to exculpate this *Cyprianus Anglicanus*; proves, to a demonstration, that this hot-headed prelate, was not slandered, in being charged with a design to carry over the church of England, to that of *Rome*: or, as *Heylin* himself expresses it “ to make an atonement between the two churches,” i. e. to set them at one again: atonement being a word used at that time, to signify a reconciliation and re-union. For which reason, among a thousand others, I must beg leave to strike out *Laud* from the list of our *brightest ecclesiastical ornaments*: and dismiss him with that just observation of Bishop *Burnet*, who remarks, that while *Laud's* enemies “ did really magnify him by their inhuman prosecution; his friends, *Heylin* and *Wharton*, have as much lessened him: the one, by writing his life; and the other, by publishing his

his vindication of himself. [Summary of Aff. before the Restor. p. 68. 8vo. edit.]

As for *Hammond, Bull, Tillotson, Sharp, and Stillingfleet*; they are names not to be mentioned without honour. Yet it does not follow that Arminianism is either right in itself, or the doctrine of our church, because adopted by these otherwise eminent and worthy persons. Nor do the greatness of their names, and the brightness of their talents, sanctify the errors they might happen to patronize, or one jot mitigate the crime of subscribing to articles they did not believe. Let them have been ever so great ornaments to our church in other respects: *this*, surely, is no ornamental part of their characters. Dross does not cease to be dross, because some gold may chance to be blended with it: nor error cease to be such, because adopted by men of merit.— However, I think, when your hand had been in, you might have reminded us of some *more* persons, who were, in every respect, ornamental to our church; and *true, consistent* sons of it, by believing and maintaining her fundamental doctrines: such as *Abbot, Grindal, Usher, Williams, Davenant, Downham, Carlton, Hall, Barlow* (of LINCOLN), *Beveridge, Hopkins, &c. &c.* all of whom were Bishops, and (for which reason you threw them into shades) *Predestinarians*. After all, truth does not depend on names. The doctrines of the church are to be learned from the articles and homilies of *the church herself*; not from the private opinions of some individuals who lay hold on the skirt of her garment, call themselves by her name, and live by her revenues.

You proceed. “*Our Articles have been vindicated from the charge of Calvinism, by Bishop Bull, Dr. Waterland, and several other religious and learned men.*” You should rather have said, “They have laboured hard to do it, but were not able.” Like some disciples of old, they toiled all the day, but could take nothing. When *Dr. Bull* was strongly pressed with his *subscription*, by the famous *Dr. Tully* (who was then principal of *that very hall* from whence the six religious students were lately

lately expelled ; and afterwards Dean and Chancellor of *Carlisle*;) Bull, in his answer, only huddles the matter up, and slides over it, as well as he can, in this slight, equivocating manner : “ *Quæ deinceps, in hoc capite, sequuntur, à D. Tullio, declamatorio more effusa, de regiâ declaratione articulis nostris præfixâ ; de cānone ecclesiæ ; de subscriptionibus & juramentis nostris toties repetitis ; ea tum demùm ad nos pertinere fatebimur, cum evicerit ille, quicquam nos docuisse unquam, quod CLARÆ alicui ecclesiæ nostræ definitioni adversetur **.” i. e. “ *I shall then acknowledge myself to be affected by what Dr. Tully subjoins, in his declamatory way, concerning the king’s declaration prefixed to our articles ; the canon, he refers to ; and my so often repeated oaths and subscriptions ; when he shall have demonstrated that I ever affirmed any thing contrary to any CLEAR determination of our church.*” But the misfortune was, this had actually been demonstrated before : whence Dr. Tully took occasion to press the matter home to Bull’s conscience ; justly upbraiding him, not for espousing those doctrines which he took for true, but for *swearing* and *setting his hand* to articles which, if his own system was right, were and must be *erroneous* and *false*. This home thrust the Arminian doctor endeavoured to parry off, by insinuating, that the determinations of the church, in behalf of the Calvinistic principles, are not sufficiently *clear*, but *dark* and *ambiguous*. As if she had not *clearly determined* that “ *Predestination is the everlasting purpose of God,*” and that we are “ *justified by faith, only !*” After this rate, *any* unbelieving subscriber whatever, when taxed with dishonesty and prevarication, need only cry out, with bishop Bull, “ *The determinations of our church are not clear :*” and he slips his neck out of the collar very cleverly. But, a *determination*, which is *not clear*, is in reality *no* determination at all : and either the church has absolutely determined *nothing*, and is a church without

* Apol. pro Harm. inter Opera, p. 660. Sect. 12.

any fixed principles; or her determinations are *clear* and *peremptory*: and, of course, the integrity of such persons as *subscribe* to those determinations, without believing them, is not very conspicuous.

One of the most furious Arminians now living (the *John Goodwin* of the present age) seems to have refined upon Bishop Bull in this particular. This Arminian is Mr. *John Wesley*: who, like many others, endeavouring to leap over the 17th article of the church of England, very gravely tells us, that that article, which treats of predestination, "*only defines the term,*" but does not affirm the doctrine. By this new rule, *all* our positive articles are only so many *definitions of terms*: the first, for instance, defines the meaning of the word *Trinity*; the ninth defines *original sin*; the 27th is a definition of *baptism*; and the 39th defines an *oath*. So the church is founded, not upon *doctrines*, but on bare *definitions*: and is not a *teacher*, but a *definer*. Is there a Jew, a Turk, or a Papist, who would scruple to subscribe our articles, considered simply as *definitions of certain terms and phrases*? or is there a Protestant in the world, but might safely set his hand to *Pope Pius's Creed*, upon a similar supposition? I leave to the consideration of Dr. *Nowell*, and of the public; who are to be deemed *Methodists* and *Sec-tarians*? They, who believe the doctrines of the church, as they stand in her articles, without sophistication and disguise? or they, who, with Mr. Wesley and some others, subscribe the articles, not *as articles of faith*, but either *as ecclesiastical definitions of terms*, or at most *as determinations which are not clear*? By this loose, shagging way of evading the force of church-decisions, and weakening the sacred ties of solemn and repeated subscriptions; the spiritual fence of our establishment is broken down and trod under foot: and the church, like a city without walls, or an house stript of its doors, lies open to the entrance of every comer, whether friend or foe, who has opportunity of getting in. Such, I fear, is, in great measure, the present condition of our once admirable church. I can only, for my own part, be faithful to her

B

myself;

myself; pour out my soul for her, in secret, at the throne of grace; and, 'till God pours down a spirit of reformation on many of her pretended sons, cry over her, saying, Alas! my Mother! *Her gates are sunk into the ground; he hath destroyed and broken her bars; the law is no more; her prophets also find no vision from the Lord, What thing shall I liken to thee, O daughter of Jerusalem? what shall I equal to thee, that I may comfort thee, O virgin daughter of Sion? for thy breach is great, like the sea; who can heal thee?* Lam. iii.

As to Dr. *Waterland*, on whose attempts, to weed out Calvinism from our articles you lay so great stress; I grant, that, like the prelate last mentioned, he fought through thick and thin, and strained every nerve, in order, if possible, to Arminianize the church. But his Success was very far from being equal to his Toil. This learned and excellent person never lost himself more visibly, nor was ever *pinched* more sensibly, than when his own artillery was turned upon him by *Sykes*. The inference, urged by the latter, is too glaring to be denied: viz. That, if ARIAN subscription to TRINITARIAN articles is palpably dishonest; then, by all the rules of argument in the world, ARMINIAN subscription to articles, that are CALVINISTIC, must and can be no less criminal. This was the *Gordian knot*, which Dr. *Waterland*, with all his straining, could never untie. Therefore this great man, finding himself wedged fast between the horns of this unavoidable dilemma; namely, *either* to give up the point, and own subscribing Arminians to be as inexcusable as subscribing Arians; *or* that, if *those* might subscribe, *Salvâ Conscientiâ*, so might *these*, since what is lawful for the raven is as lawful for the crow;—the Doctor, to free himself, as well as he could, from this embarrassment, resolved to *cut the knot* at once, by roundly DENYING that our articles are Calvinistical. But every struggle he made, and every argument he brought in support of this palpable falsehood (which he adopted only *pro re natâ*, and to help himself out at a dead lift), only plunged him in deeper difficulties,

ties, by giving his Arian adversaries this advantage against him, That, upon the Doctor's own principles, and by virtue of his own example, *they* were as much at liberty, *mutatis mutandis*, to put *their own sense* upon the 1st, 2d, 5th, and 8th articles; as Waterland was to put *his sense* upon the 9th, 10th, 11th and 17th: since the very letter of *these* articles is no less determinate, in favour of *original sin*, the utter *impotence of free-will in spirituals*, gratuitous *justification without works*, and *eternal, absolute predestination*; than *those* are, in favour of *the Trinity*, the *Godhead of Christ*, the *Godhead of the Holy Ghost*, and the orthodoxy of *the three creeds*.

And, indeed, the case speaks for itself. For, if *one sort* of men may fairly claim the privilege of clipping, mincing, and wire-drawing *some* articles, as a salvo for subscription; why may not *another sort* of men be allowed to take the same liberty with the rest? Let not, then, the subscribing Arminian (though he may happen to be a Trinitarian) exclaim against the subscribing Arian, the subscribing Socinian, or even the subscribing Deist. Only grant it lawful to wrench the articles *one way*; and it is as lawful to wrench them *any way*, or *every way*. If an *Arminian* may *stretch* the 17th article into conditional predestination, and universal redemption; an *Arian* has just as much right to *lop short* the 2d article, so far as it stands in his way. By the same rule that our articles are *drawn aside* from any one part of their plain, grammatical import; they may be frothed into no meaning whatever, and bandied about towards every point of the compass. If a subscriber is really at liberty to pick and chuse *which* of them, and *which part* of them, he will believe, and which he shall reject; *which* to subscribe *sincerely*, and *which* with *secret provisos* of his own; subscription is no longer a *fence against error*, but becomes a *mere stalking horse*, and the articles themselves a *nose of wax*. St. Paul's words, with a slight variation, may be accommodated to the case in hand. *Thou art inexcusable* [O subscribing Arminian,] *whoever thou art, that judgest* [the subscribing Arian];

for, wherein thou judgest, [him,] thou condemnest thyself : for thou, that judgest, doest the same thing [in another way.] Rom. ii. 1.

Thus, the gap of prevaricating subscription being once opened, “we may,” to use Dr. Waterland’s own words, “bid adieu to principles;” and, between one subscriber and another, the church of England will have no settled doctrines left: or, at most, they will exist no where but in ink and paper, between the leaves of her *liturgy* and *homilies*, and in the forgotten writings of her *old divines*.

*Foreign comedians, a spruce band, arrive;
And push her from the scene, or hiss her there.*

Should matters go on for half a century longer, as they have done for many years back; the most respectable church in the world will be reduced, by some of those who call themselves her children, to the same condition that the man in the fable was, by his two wives:

*Ambæ videri dum volunt illi pares,
Capillos homini legere cœpêre invicem.
Quum se putârat pingi curâ mulierum,
Calvus repente factus est : nam funditus
Canos puella, nigros anus, evellerat.*

I pray God, that the *Delilabs*, who make it their business to shear the church of its locks, by robbing it gradually of its doctrines; may not, at the long run, deliver it quite up into the hands of the *Philistines*.

Bishop Burnet went to work, in a much more plausible manner, than either Bishop Bull or Dr. Waterland. He contributed as much, in fact, towards opening a door to prevaricating subscription, as they: but did it with more decency, and with a better regard to appearances. He does not drive so furiously as those *Jebu* writers, nor insult the common reason of mankind, by fiercely insisting that our articles are not Calvinistic: but hit on a more trimming expedient, and would gently insinuate, that they are worded with, what he calls, such *moderation and latitude*, that Calvinists and Arminians too may mutually testify their assent by subscription. I mean

mean not to depreciate that truly great and good prelate's exposition of the articles: which is, in general, a very masterly and valuable performance*. I am not entirely of Dr. South's mind, who, you know, Sir, being asked, soon after its publication, what he thought of it? replied, in his smart way, "*Think of it? I think, that, in his exposition of our 39 articles, his lordship has given the church forty stripes save one.*" That the Bishop has given the church *three or four stripes*, I think, can hardly be denied: and unhappy is the *mother*, who receives such usage at the hands of the *sons* she has nourished and brought up. Thus much is certain: that Burnet plays fast and loose, whenever Calvinism and subscription fall in his way. Hence those two contradictory positions of his; "*Subscription does import an assent to the article: and —an article being conceived in such general words, that it can admit of DIFFERENT LITERAL and GRAMMATICAL senses; even when the senses given are PLAINLY CONTRARY one to another, yet both may subscribe the article with a good conscience, and without any equivocation.*"

[Intro. to Exp. Art. p. 10.] As if there could be more *literal* senses of a proposition than *one*! and those numerous senses could be *plainly contrary* one to another, and yet be all *literally* and *grammatically* the sense of that proposition! An Arian, a Papist, or a Deist, may, *with a good conscience, and, without any equivocation*, subscribe those very articles, which, *literally* and *grammatically*, conclude point-blank against Arianism, Popery, and Deism!

That learned and able divine, Dr. Edwards, of Cambridge, published, in the life-time of Bishop Burnet, some strictures on that prelate's way of treating the articles. "I can by no means," says he, "approve of this learned prelate's extravagant attempt, when he takes a great deal of pains to persuade his readers, that these thirty-nine articles, or most of them, are so *dark* and *ambiguous*, that the true sense of them is not to be found out: and therefore that we may make what construc-

* The lower House of Convocation, in 1701, severely censured Burnet's Exposition of the Articles. See Tindal, 15. 319.

" tion of them we please. Surely, his lordship's memory
 " is none of the best : any man must needs think that he
 " had forgot what he had asserted and given as his
 " judgment, namely, That these are *articles* of down-
 " right *belief*, and therefore must not be dallied and
 " played with. It is such a strange perverting of the ar-
 " ticles, as cannot but raise admiration in indifferent
 " persons, and such as are not led by prejudice. For,
 " 1st, This new-found exposition fosters *dissimulation*.
 " It seems to teach our clergymen to *equivocate*. For,
 " though the learned and reverend author acknow-
 " ledges, once and again, that the *compilers* of those
 " articles were *Calvinistically* disposed, and accordingly
 " formed some of the articles so as they are to be under-
 " stood in favour of *Calvin's* opinions ; yet he proposes
 " them to the clergy, to be taken in an ambiguous
 " sense. They are taught, in the whole, to trim ; to
 " turn about as they please ; to dissemble with God and
 " man ; to subscribe to that, which, they know, most as-
 " suredly, is, in the plain meaning of it, against their
 " persuasion. Therefore I say that this *new-coined ex-*
 " *plication* of the articles, is inconsistent with the *intè-*
 " *grity* of our church, and the *sincerity* of its mini-
 " sters who are to subscribe to them. It will be hard
 " to reconcile this with the doing it *with a good consci-*
 " *ence*, as is required in the 5th canon ; and *ex animo*,
 " and *avoiding all ambiguities*, as the 36th canon en-
 " joins. [2.] After this rate, it can never be known,
 " from our professions and subscriptions, WHAT our
 " mind is, WHAT our belief and sentiments are.
 " Though we *openly acknowledge*, UNDER OUR HANDS,
 " *such doctrines to be agreeable to God's word* ; yet we may
 " not think one article of them to be true : yea, we may
 " think and profess the quite contrary. And of this our
 " author [Burnet] gives us an instance in himself : tell-
 " ing us [in his preface to the Expos. of the Art.] that,
 " in the point of *predestination*, he follows the *Greek church*,
 " from which *St. Austin* departed, and formed a new system :
 " and yet he publicly declares, that *our church's article*
 " of

“ of predestination may be interpreted and understood
 “ in favour of the *Calvinists*, who follow *St. Augustin*.
 “ I remember this learned writer, in the account he
 “ gives us of his travels, makes this reflection on *Geneva*, that *there is want of SINCERITY there*. May
 “ we not, from what has been represented under this
 “ particular, fear, that there is the *same want somewhere*
 “ *else?*” [Veritas Red. p. 521, 522.]

But I return to Doctor *Nowell*. Another part of your address to the author of *Pietas Oxoniensis* runs thus:
 “ *Supposing that they and we,*” namely, the Arminians of past and present times, “ *are mistaken, in the sense*
 “ *WE PUT upon our articles; yet, surely, unless you can see*
 “ *our hearts, you cannot censure us for subscribing to what*
 “ *we believe not a word of.*” You do well, Sir, to suppose yourself and your Arminian friends *mistaken*. I hope, your next step will be, to *retract* your mistakes. And you have fallen into not a few, in the very paragraph last cited. 1st, You seem to take for granted, that you have a right to put *your own sense* on the articles to which you subscribe. But this is by no means the case. Our *Articles*, like the prophecies, are *not of private interpretation*. You, and I, and every subscriber, are, by express declaration of authority, pin’d down to the plain, *literal and grammatical meaning* of each article. The legislature, duly weighing the importance and solemn nature of ecclesiastical subscription, have taken almost every precaution, human wisdom could suggest, or the energy of language furnish, to preclude evasion, and preserve the doctrines of the church inviolate. Let part of *the royal declaration*, usually prefixed to the articles themselves, and which, having never been revoked, still stands in full force; serve by way of specimen: “ We
 “ have, upon mature deliberation, and with the advice
 “ of so many of our Bishops as might conveniently be
 “ called together, thought fit to make this declaration
 “ following; That the ARTICLES of the church of
 “ England do contain the TRUE DOCTRINE OF THE
 “ CHURCH of England, agreeable to God’s word:

“ which we do therefore ratify and confirm, prohibit-
 “ ing *the* LEAST *difference* from the said articles ;—
 “ from which we will not endure ANY VARYING OR DE-
 “ PARTING in the *least degree* :—And that no man,
 “ hereafter, shall either print or preach, to *draw the ar-*
 “ *ticle* ASIDE any way, but shall submit to it in the
 “ PLAIN and FULL meaning thereof; and shall *not* PUT
 “ HIS OWN SENSE, or comment, to be the meaning of the
 “ article, but shall take it in the LITERAL and GRAM-
 “ MATICAL sense.” Hence it is as evident, as demon-
 stration can make it, that *Calvinists* are the only fair
 subscribers; and that *Arminians*, as such, are virtually
 excluded from subscription: because, the articles are to
 be subscribed, not with *qualifying glosses, diluting com-*
ments, tacit limitations, and mental exceptions (for this
 would defeat the very end for which subscription is re-
 quired :) but we are to subscribe, as every subscriber
 professes to do, *ex animo*; with *unfeigned assent and con-*
sent; without *drawing aside* the articles ANY way, or
varying or departing from them in the *least degree*: more-
 over, without *putting* the subscriber’s OWN SENSE ON
 what he subscribes unto, but honestly and *bonâ fide*,
 taking the articles in their *literal* and *grammatical* mean-
 ing, simply as they stand.

2dly, You would insinuate, that we cannot charge
 the Arminians with subscribing to what they do not be-
 lieve, “ *except we could look into their hearts.*” But there
 is no occasion for our looking quite so deep as that:
 since, out of the abundance of their hearts, their hands
 write and their mouths speak. I think, that I myself,
 without pretending to dive into hearts, may form a
 judgment, for instance, of Dr. Nowell and *his* subscrip-
 tions. You, Sir, have subscribed, to our articles and
 homilies, over and over again. These articles and ho-
 milies are * Calvinistic: and you are a professed Armi-
 nian.

* The Calvinism of these has been acknowledged by very many
 of the Arminians themselves. One, in particular, recurs, this mo-
 ment to my remembrance. — A late dignitary (Dr. H.) of consi-
 derable figure, both in the church and in the world, and celebrated
 among

nian. Either, therefore, you was *not* an Arminian when you subscribed ; or you subscribed to what you *disbelieved*. And, by the same rule that we form an estimate of *you*, we are qualified to judge of *others* of your sect.

3dly, I discern not a little chicanery in the latter clause of your paragraph ; “ *you cannot censure us for subscribing to what we believe NOT A WORD of.*” This is brought in, by way of a *trap-door*, to escape at, in case you should happen to be hard pressed. You may believe A WORD, and *many* words, even in the 17th article itself ; without believing the *substance* of the article, or assenting to *the doctrine* it asserts. There are not a few detached *words*, even in the decrees of *Trent*, to which any Protestant in the world might safely testify his assent : and yet no truly conscientious Protestant would look upon that as a sufficient warrant for setting his hand to those execrable decisions. And by parity of argument, I greatly question, whether any truly honest and conscientious Arminian would venture to rest upon this, as a plea for subscription, “ Though I abhor, detest, and “ abjure, as impious and Calvinistical, the *doctrines* contained in the 10th, 11th, and 17th articles of the “ church of England ; yet as a subscriber to those “ articles, I make myself easy, because I cannot say that “ I believe NOT A WORD in them ; for there are some “ words, here and there interspersed, which are of “ innocent tendency : and, for the sake of these, I have “ swallowed the whole.” Instead of shifting, and mincing, and trimming, in this despicable manner ; would it not be more to the credit of such clergymen as are Arminians, to make a push for an *alteration*, and boldly cry out, with *the Monthly Reviewers*, “ Our established among other things, for a learned and sensible work, published under the title of *Theological Lectures* ; being, one day, in company with another dignitary (now living, and from whom I had it), the conversation happened to turn on the *thirty-nine articles* : against several of which Dr. H. exclaimed with great warmth. My friend asked him, “ But have you not *subscribed* to these, and that *ex animo* ? ” I have. “ And do not you hold all your preferments *by virtue of that subscription* ? ” I do ; and our reformers, who drew up such articles, **DESERVED TO BE HANGED for their pains.**

“ doctrines

“ doctrines are not such as might be wished, and ought
 “ to be re-modeled ?” Let them act like men of *courage*
 and *principle* ; and, instead of doubling and winding, and
 putting our articles on the rack, “ to find out meanings
 “ never meant,” say of them, and of the 17th in par-
 ticular (as Archbishop *Tillotson* did of the Athanasian
 Creed), “ *I heartily wish we were well rid of it.*” This
 would be treading in the steps of their *elder brethren*, the
Dutch Arminians ; and would make them *Remonstrants*
 in *act*, as well as in *principles*. It would not, indeed,
 vindicate them from the *glaring dishonesty* of *solemnly sub-*
scribing to articles thus *professedly disbelieved* : but it would
 save them the ridiculous and fruitless trouble of endeavour-
 ing to *twist* and *torture* Calvinistic articles into a sense they
 are incapable of bearing. The *reverend* and *dignified* au-
 thor of *the confessional*, is a *saint*, when set in competition
 with *such* divines as would put out our eyes, by daring
 to tell us that the 10th article does NOT overturn free-
 will ; that the 11th does NOT assert justification by faith
 only ; and that the 17th does NOT teach everlasting,
 absolute, gratuitous predestination.

How am I grieved to hear such gentlemen, as the
 writers of *the Independent Whig*, triumph over us in such
 strains as these ! “ At one time, *predestination* is of high
 “ consequence, and made an *article of faith*, and all
 “ *freewillers* should be BANISHED the land, or LOCKED
 “ UP IN DUNGEONS, like wild beasts ; which was the
 “ judgments of the Bishops, in James the 1st’s days*,
 “ concerning

* The *fact* asserted, is undoubtedly true ; but there seems to be
 an anachronism in assigning the *date*. I cannot find, that the bishops,
 in James the 1st’s time, advised the government to treat Arminians in
 this manner. It was in the reign of queen Elizabeth, that this coun-
 sel was offered by the bishops. The part of their advice, referred to,
 did, according to *Strype*, run verbatim as follows : “ *Item, That*
 “ *incorrigible Arians, Pelagians or FREE-WILL-MEN, be sent into*
 “ *some one castle, in North-Wales, or Wallingford ; and there to*
 “ *live of their own labour and exercise ; and none other be*
 “ *suffered to resort unto them, but their KEEPERS : until they be*
 “ *found to repent their errors.*” *Strype’s Annals of the Reforma-*
tion, &c. during the first twelve years of Q. Eliz. chap. 17.
p. 207. I do not quote this mortifying paragraph, from any *appro-*
bation,

“ concerning the *Arminians*. At a different season;
 “ when preferments ran high on the other side, as in
 “ King Charles the 1st’s reign, and ever since; *Armi-*
 “ *nianism* not only recovers credit but grows *modish*,
 “ and, consequently, *orthodox*; whilst *predestination* be-
 “ comes an *old-fashioned* piece of faith, and a sure sign
 “ of *Fanaticism*. And yet it continues *one of the 39 ar-*
 “ *ticles*; and yet it must not be *believed*; and yet it must
 “ be *signed* and *assented to* with a SINCERE assent.” [Ind.
 Wh. vol. 2. p. 9.] I am perfectly shocked, that the
 same writers should have any shadow of ground for ad-
 dressing some of our body in the following style: “ Is
 “ there one of you, that conforms to the *genuine sense*,
 “ or even to *the words* of the articles? Are not those
 “ articles *Calvinistical*? were they not composed by *Cal-*
 “ *vinists*? And are you not now, and have been long,
 “ *Arminians*? And do you not write and preach against
 “ [those] who defend *predestination*, which is one of
 “ your own articles? Will you say that *Articles*, will
 “ you say that *Oaths*, are to be taken in a sense DIFFE-
 “ RENT *from the words*, DIFFERENT *from the meaning*,
 “ of *those who composed them*? If you do, then you
 “ maintain that *Papists*, nay, *Mahometans*, may sub-
 “ scribe our Protestant articles, and be still Mahome-
 “ tans and Papists: and that *Jacobites* may take the
 “ *state-oaths*, and be still Jacobites. What subscrip-
 “ tions, or declarations, or, indeed, what other ties,
 “ can *bind* men who—*subscribe the direct contrary* to
 “ what they *believe*? Subscribe the doctrines of Calvin,

bation, I entertain, of the expedient recommended: for I abhor every
 thing that even *looks* like persecution for principles merely religious.
 But I cannot help deducing two conclusions from this curious por-
 tion of our Ecclesiastical History: 1st. That FREE-WILL-MEN were
 considered, by the church of England, when in her purity, as some
 of the most dangerous *recusants* she had to grapple with; else, she
 would never have advised the *confining* them in a remote prison, and
 prohibiting them from the access of all persons, their *keepers* only
 excepted. 2dly, That FREE-WILL-MEN, at that time, were *very*
few in number: otherwise, *one castle*, however spacious, would not
 have been thought large enough to contain them. I heartily congratu-
 late our *present* free-willers, on their living in an age of liberty.

“ yet

“ yet remain antagonists to *Calvin*? Is this practice,
 “ this solemn assertion of a falsehood, for the honour of
 “ religion, or of churchmen? or is it not the *direct me-*
 “ *thod* to harden men against truth and conscience, and
 “ to turn holy things into contempt? yet you still go
 “ on to *subscribe* those articles; still to *disbelieve* and
 “ contradict them.” [Ibid. vol. 3. p. 403, 404.]

Object not, that these quotations are brought from men whose attachment to our church, and indeed to Christianity in general, was liable to suspicion. I grant it was. Yet,

Fas est, et ab hoste doceri.

And truth is truth, let it come from what quarter it will. The question ought not to be, “ Were these men our “ enemies?” but, “ Are these things so?” If they be, such writers as Dr. Nowell ought to turn their eyes inward, and recollect, that *themselves* are the persons, who give the friends of our excellent church reason to lament, and open the mouths of her enemies to blaspheme.

But, if the expostulations of the *Independent Whig* be repudiated, as coming from a suspected quarter; permit me to remind you, Sir, of three very remarkable passages, the same, in substance, with the preceding, though *written by persons of your own principles*: I mean Dr. Heylin, Bp. Burnet, and Dr. Waterland. The introducing them here, is, indeed, an *anticipation*, which reverses, in some measure, the plan I proposed at first setting out: but as I am on the subject of *Arminian subscription*, I will dispatch it once for all.—Dr. *Peter Heylin*, who was chaplain to Archbishop *Laud* and King Charles the 1st, and was both a *Laudæan* and a *Carolite* in grain; an author, whom you closely follow, and whose *Quinquarticular History* seems to have furnished you with a considerable part of that book you lately offered to the public; does, in that very history, Arminian as he was, express himself thus: “ The com-
 “ posers of the articles of the church of England had
 “ not so little in them of the dove, or so much of the
 “ serpent,

“ serpent, as to make the articles of the church like an
 “ *upright shoe*, which may be worn on either foot; or
 “ like to *Theramenēs*’ shoe, as the adage hath it, *fit for*
 “ *the foot of every man that was pleased to wear it*. And
 “ therefore we may say, of our first reformers, in refe-
 “ rence to the present book of articles,—— that those
 “ reverend and learned men intended not to deceive
 “ any, by *ambiguous terms*.—The first reformers did
 “ not so compose the articles, as to leave *any liberty* to
 “ *dissenting* judgments; but did bind men to the literal
 “ and grammatical sense: they had not otherwise at-
 “ tained to the end they aimed at, which was *ad tollen-*
 “ *dam opinionum dissensionem, & consensum in verâ religi-*
 “ *one firmandum*. i. e. *To take away DIVERSITY of opi-*
 “ *nions, and to establish an AGREEMENT in the true reli-*
 “ *gion*. Which end could never be effected, if men
 “ were left unto the liberty of dissenting, or might
 “ have leave to PUT THEIR OWN SENSE upon the ar-
 “ ticles, as they list themselves. For, where there is a
 “ purpose of permitting men to their own opinions,
 “ there is no need of definitions and determinations in
 “ a national church: no more than is of making laws
 “ to bind the subjects in an unsettled commonwealth,
 “ with an intent to leave them in their former liberty,
 “ either of keeping or not keeping them, as themselves
 “ best pleased.” [Hist. Quinq. part 2. chap. 8. sect. 12.]
 Bishop Burnet’s testimony is as follows: “ I come,
 “ in the next place, to consider what the clergy are
 “ bound to by their subscriptions. The *meaning of*
 “ *every subscription* is to be taken from the DESIGN of
 “ *the imposer*, and from the WORDS of *the subscription*
 “ *itself*. The title of the articles, bears, That they
 “ were ‘agreed upon in convocation, for the avoiding
 “ of diversities of opinions, and for the stablishing
 “ consent touching true religion.’ Where it is evident,
 “ that a *consent in opinion* is designed. If we, in the
 “ next place, consider the declaration that the church
 “ has made in the *canons*, that though, by the 5th
 “ canon, which relates to the whole body of the peo-
 “ ple,

" ple, such only are declared to be excommunicated
 " *ipso facto*, who shall affirm any of the articles to be
 " erroneous, or such as he may not with a good con-
 " science subscribe to; yet the 36th canon is *express*
 " for the clergy, requiring them to subscribe *willingly*
 " and *ex animo*, and acknowledge ALL and EVERY article
 " to be agreeable to the word of God: upon which canon
 " it is, that the *form of the subscription* runs in those
 " words; which seem expressly to declare a man's *own*
 " opinion, and not a bare consent to an article of peace,
 " or an engagement to silence and submission. The
 " statute of the 13th of queen Elizabeth, cap. 12,
 " which gives the legal authority to our requiring sub-
 " scriptions in order to a man's being capable of a be-
 " nefice; requires, that every clergyman should read
 " the articles in the church, and that with a declaration
 " of his UNFEIGNED ASSENT to them. These things
 " make it appear very plain, that the subscriptions of
 " the clergy, must be considered as a declaration of
 " their own opinion, and not as a bare obligation to
 " silence." [Intro. to Exp. of the Art. p. 9.]

Dr. Waterland shall close the rear. In his *Preface*
 to his *first defence of some Queries*, page 4th, he informs
 his readers, that Dr. Clarke had lately published a
 second edition of his *Scripture-doctrine of the Trinity*;
 on which Waterland has this remark; " One thing I
 " must observe for the Doctor [Clarke's] honour, that,
 " in his new edition, he has left out these words of
 " his former Introduction, ' It is plain, that every
 " person may reasonably agree to such forms, whenever he
 " can, in any sense at all, reconcile them with scripture.'
 " I hope, none, hereafter, will pretend to make use
 " of the Doctor's authority, for SUBSCRIBING to forms
 " which they believe not ACCORDING TO THE TRUE
 " and PROPER SENSE OF THE WORDS, and the KNOWN
 " INTENT of the IMPOSERS and COMPILERS. Such
 " prevarication is in itself a bad thing, and would, in
 " time, have a very ill influence on the *morals* of a
 " nation.

“ nation *. If either *state oaths*, on one hand; or
 “ CHURCH SUBSCRIPTIONS, on the other; once come
 “ to be *made light of*, and SUBTILTIES be invented to
 “ defend or palliate such GROSS INSINCERITY; we may
 “ bid farewell to *principles*, and *religion* will be little
 “ else but *disguised Atheism*.” Awful, pertinent, striking words! Happy would it have been, had *Heylin*, *Burnet*, and *Waterland* but stood *througout* to their own principles! Instead of which, each of the learned triumvirate openly disavowed, in his own practice, upon some certain occasions, what he had so solidly established with his pen. But though these great men, whenever the *Calvinistic* doctrines of the church came in their way, turned themselves back, like *Ephraim*, and were as frightened at Calvin’s *positions* (though subscribed to by themselves) as they could have been at his *apparition*; thus, *Penelope* like, unraveling the very webb they had taken such pains to weave; yet their *remarks* themselves are not the less true. The plain case was this: when these persons had to deal with an antagonist who happened to espouse any particular opinion that did not tally with their own; they presently knocked him down with the authority of *the church* articles: but when this same authority was, in other particulars, urged against themselves; they paid no more regard to articles and subscriptions, than other people. Like some tyrants, of whom it is recorded, that they would allow none but themselves to trample on the laws with impunity; or like the man who could, upon occasion, drub his wife soundly, but would suffer nobody else to lift a finger against her †. — Only admit the three preceding citations to be just, reasonable and true; and the consequence is un-

* We have lived to see this prediction of Dr. Waterland’s too well fulfilled.

† So the popish princes of Europe cry up the authority of the *Roman Bishop*, when that authority is to be made use of as an engine to promote their own designs: but, when *that* end is answered, the authority of his holiness is enforced no longer; but treated with the contempt it deserves, and, like an old tool, thrown by ’till it is wanted.

deniable;

deniable: namely, That Arminian subscription is absolutely unjustifiable, Arminians themselves being judges. Were the same insincerity and prevarications allowed of, in the secular affairs of common life, which too often obtain in religious transactions; all social connections would quickly be at an end, and every band, by which mankind are tied to each other, must vanish as a wreath of smoke.

It is impossible, on this occasion, not to recollect the stigma of infamy, universally, and deservedly, fastened on *Eusebius* of *Nicomede*, for subscribing the *Nicene-Creed*, whilst he disbelieved it in his heart: and on *Arius* himself, for presenting a *sham* confession of his faith to the Emperor *Constantine*, and ratifying it with his *oath*; when, at the same time, he really meant no such thing, but endeavoured to patch up matters with conscience, by *mentally* referring the oath he had taken, not to the declaration he had just made, but to a summary of his opinions, previously written, and which he had then privately about him, concealed in his cloaths. I would not be misunderstood, as if I meant to put all Arminians on a par with Arians: I only draw the parallel, or rather point out the similitude, so far as *prevaricating subscriptions* and *false declarations of assent* are concerned.

In the process of your answer to the author of *Pietas Oxoniensis*, you would fain press those two venerable prelates and martyrs, *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, into the service of *Arminius*: and, to prove your point, very pompously refer us, page 71, to a motley, ungainly volume, published in 1543, by order of Henry VIII. and entitled, “The necessary Erudition of a Christian Man.” Since you think fit, Sir, to lay such mighty stress on this mongrel production; I will enlarge a little, in giving some account of it: only premising, that it had been for the credit both of yourself and of your tenets, had you let this *Popish book* wholly alone. You introduce it thus: “*what their opinions were,*” i. e. the opinions of *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, “*with regard to*
2 “*the*

the doctrines of free-agency, &c. may be seen in the book called *Pia & Catholica Institutio, or Erudition of a Christian Man*; published 1543, by the King's authority, and authorized by the Bishops, with Archbishop Cranmer at the head of them." The exact title of your favourite book was this: 'A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christen Man, set furthe by the Kynge's Majestie of England, &c. London. By Thomas Barthelet, 1543*.' Henry was vehemently bent on the publication of this work; and even took the pains to correct it throughout, while in manuscript, with his own hand. No wonder, therefore, that a prince of Henry's self-opinion, and known attachment to the doctrinal parts of Popery (which continued with him to the last), should suffer little or nothing to stand in it, but what comported with his own notions. These (his own notions), however crude, ridiculous and irrational, he was ever resolved, by fair means or foul, to ram down the throats of all his subjects. Witness the unheard-of execution of Protestants and Papists, in one and the same day: the former, for *not* being Papists, in matters of doctrine; the latter, for *being* Papists in the article of the pope's supremacy. The book, which you so devotedly admire, and to which you so often appeal; very much resembles that promiscuous execution: being such a jumble of errors and contradictions, as was, perhaps, never, before, obtruded on a nation. It should be remembered, that the *statute of the six ar-*

* It was first written and publish'd in 1540, a year very unfavourable to the interests of the Reformation.

1. Cromwell's fall put the Reformation to a stand; *Burnet*, 1. 278.

2. The Mass books were prevented to be alter'd; but stood much as they were, 281.

3. A severe persecution immediately follow'd: among them, suffer'd the Rev. Mr. R. W. among whose heresys are ranked his Denial of Merit and Free-will. *Strype*, vol. 1. p. 369.

The Protestants were glad, to see things were no worse; and the Papists, to see them so bad. The former hop'd, that, the ice being now broke, Popery would gradually melt away; the latter, seeing the leading Articles of their Superstition ratify'd and confirm'd afresh, hop'd it was prelusive to the re-erection of the whole frame.

ticles (passed into a law four years before, and not repealed until the first year of the following reign) was in full force, at the very time* of this publication: therefore it need not seem strange, that this book, whose *authority* you so greatly magnify, and on whose *contents* (sorry am I for it) you set so high a value, should harmonize with those *detestable and bloody articles* in the doctrine of *transubstantiation* and other points relative to *the mass*. It also gives a paraphrase on the *Ave Maria*; admits of *burning incense to images*, and of *kneeling* before them; asserts the *mediation* of departed saints in behalf of the living, and that we may lawfully *pray* to them for an interest in their intercession; That the sacraments are *seven* in number; and that the fourth commandment, respecting the observation of the *sabbath*, was purely ceremonial; That it is charitable and commendable to *pray for the dead*: with much more of the same Popish trumpery. All these particulars shew, how little hand *Cranmer* and *Ridley* had, in composing this book. And, if the book itself can be seriously thought, by you, or by any reasonable man, really to contain the genuine sentiments of our reformers; it must be owned, that such a *reformation* left Popery much as it found it, and that the *reformers* themselves wanted reforming.—Good God! what shall we come to at last! A Protestant; a Protestant Divine; a Protestant Divine of the Church of England; dares, in the face of the sun, to *rake* into the *sink* of an antiquated *Popish* book, in order to throw up *mud*, with which to spatter the doctrines of that reformed church whose bread he eats, and whose rayment he wears! Rather than not carry his point, he, who lives on the banks of the *Isis*, is not ashamed to dip his pen in the

* This year, 1543, was a year of Popish triumphs. 1. This book was set forth afresh. 2. A dismal persecution of Protestants followed; especially, at Windsor. 3. A conspiracy against Cranmer. 4. A league between the King and the Emperor. 5. Enjoin'd by Act of Parliament, that no women, artificers, &c. should read the Bible. 6. All spiritual persons, that should teach any thing contrary to the "Erudition," &c. See *Burnet's Ref.* vol. I. p. 306—314.

TIBER ! But, at all events, *Delenda est Carthago* : down with *Geneva* ; though *Rome* itself flourish on its ruins. Think not, Sir, that I am too warm. I only, as a Protestant, and as a church-man, feel a becoming *indignation* at this part of your conduct : an indignation, which candour warrants, and justice demands.

“ On such a theme ’twere impious to be calm.”

Surely, on a review, and at your cooler moments of recollection, you will *blush*, that you should ever have attempted to subvert Protestant doctrines, by arguments borrowed from *Rome* ! you will, for decency’s sake, forbear, in future, to call in *such* an ally, to your assistance, as the *Pia & Catholica Institutio* !

However, from this arsenal, you have, at present, thought proper (I hope, for the last time) to fetch some of your weapons ; which you brandish, in quotations, more than once, for whole pages together. Nor are your quotations altogether foreign to the purpose. But, supposing them to be ever so peremptory against the *Calvinistic* doctrines of your church and mine ; whether it be for the honour of the Arminian notions, to be propt up by citations taken from *such* a treatise, drawn up by *such* bishops as then generally filled the bench, revised by *such* a king as then occupied the throne, and published at *such* a period of Anti-Christian darkness ; must be submitted to your consideration, and that of my other Protestant readers.

Nevertheless, bad as the book is, there are some things in it, particularly under the head of *free-will*, which you prudently forbore to quote : conscious, that they look a little like *Calvinism*. These, for my own part, I *disdain* to cite. The ark of Protestant truth needs no such *leprous hands*, no such *rotten props*, for its support. The doctrinal articles of our own truly evangelical church, happily established since, neither want assistance from so corrupt a quarter ; nor can suffer the least detriment from the despicable, feeble, inconsistent cavils of a *Popish medley*, in which the print of *Gardiner’s*

gloven foot appears throughout. I will only observe farther, that the then *Pelagian*, now (since the starting up of *Pelagius the second*, I mean JAMES VAN HARMIN, about fifty years after the publishing of the book in question) *Arminian* doctrines, are, most of them, to be found in that wretched piece: such as these, That *justifying faith includes obedience to all the law of God*: That the scriptures say nothing in favour of *personal assurance*, or from whence it may be gathered that men may in this life be certain of their *election*, much less of their *perseverance* in grace to the end; That the divine promises, respecting grace and salvation, are *suspended on conditions of man's performing*; that there is *a double justification*, primary and final; that though we are *justified by works*, yet that very justification is, in some sense, by *grace*, because good works are done by God's assistance; That works, done by justified persons, are *meritorious towards the Attainment of life eternal*: and such like*. With which I take my leave of this contemptible, un-protestant performance.

You have just been dabbling in muddy water; but now the stream

“*Works itself clear, and, as it runs, refines:*”

Your next appeal† being to the *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum*; a Protestant codex, drawn up in the Protestant reign of Edward VI. But from hence, as if you liked neither the book, nor the reign in which it was written, you bring only *two* short quotations; and those not very happily chosen: for neither of them clashes with the doctrines of *election* and *final perseverance*, but on the contrary, by evident implication,

* Burnet virtually proves, that Cranmer had no hand in that part, at least, of this book, which relates to justification. This book makes works a condition, not to say, a cause, of justification; but Cranmer utterly denied them to be so: as appears from the conclusion of some papers, drawn up by him, about this time, on that important subject: for which see *Burnet*, Ref. vol. 1. 275. See *Heylin's Acknowledgment*. Life of Laud, p. 3.

† Page 74.

plainly

plainly suppose them to be true. The first passage you render thus: "*Wherefore All are to be admonished by us, that, in their undertakings and actions, they are not to refer themselves to the decrees of predestination; since, in the holy scriptures, we see promises to good actions, and threats to bad ones, proposed in general terms.*" This visibly implies, that there are, in fact, *decrees of predestination*; but that these decrees, being unknown to us, cannot, for that very reason, be the rule by which men are to square their actions and undertakings. What Calvinist ever denied this? I never knew one that did. We all hold, that God's *revealed*, not his *secret* will, is the rule of human action: and that we are not to descend from the *decree* to *events*; but, on the contrary, should ascend, from *events*, to the *decree**. God's hidden will of *determination* is and can be the rule of *his own* conduct only, because *He* only is acquainted with his own purposes in their full extent: but the grand, unerring chart of direction to men, and on which they should constantly fix their eyes, is God's declared will of *command*, set forth in the *written word*. So our church determines, article seventeenth, "In our doings, *That will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.*"

It is equally true, that, "*In the holy scriptures, we see promises to good actions, and threats to bad ones, proposed in general terms:*" i. e. It is declared, in scripture, that *such and such causes* shall generally be productive of *such and such effects*. Which is a proposition, not only granted, but insisted upon, by myself and by every Calvinist I ever yet read or met with.—So much, Sir, for your first citation. I go on to the other: "*Etiam illi de justificatis perversè sentiunt, qui credunt illos, postquam justi simul facti sunt, in peccatum non posse incidere; aut si fortè quicquam eorum faciunt, quæ Dei legibus prohibentur, ea Deum pro*

* See the Bishop of London's (Bancroft) Speech to the King, in the Hampton Court Conference, p. 29.

“*peccatis non accipere.*” I have given the *Latin*, that my readers may judge of *your translation*, which runs thus: “*They form very perverse notions of the justified, who believe, that, after they are once made just, they cannot fall into sin: or if, by chance, they should do any thing prohibited by the laws of God, that God does not impute it as sin.*” On reading this, I instantly turned to the table of *errata*, at the end of your pamphlet; but found no correction. What, Sir! does *accipio* properly signify to *impute* and *charge a thing home*? Surely, both the genius of the Latin tongue, and the sense of the passage under consideration, require us to render *accipere*, in this place, by *regard*, *consider*, or *look upon*. The whole paragraph stands thus: “*They judge very mistakingly of justified persons, who believe that such cannot fall into sin, after they are once made just: or, if they should happen to commit any of those things which are forbidden by God’s law, that God does not look upon those things as sins.*” To talk (as you would fain make the passage do) of God’s actually *imputing* sin to *justified* persons, would be a contradiction in terms: since the negative part of justification itself lies, essentially, in the *non-imputation* of any sin whatever, Psalm xxxii. 1, 2. And the man, to whom *any one* sin is *imputed* by God, is and must be, *ipso facto*, an unjustified person. All, then, that can be inferred from the passage, is, 1st, That justified men are not *impeccable*; the doctrine of *sinless perfection* in this life, even after grace received, being false, fanatical, and presumptuous. 2. That, consequently, even *justified* persons may, and too frequently do, *fall into sin*: and, 3. That, whenever they do so, God, whose judgment is necessarily according to truth, considers such falling as *sinful*; sin being sin, as much when committed by a child of God, as when committed by any other: the state of the offending person not being able to reverse the nature of things. Nay, sin is, if possible, *more exceeding sinful* in a regenerate man, than if he was not so.—But what has all
this

this to do with your novel, Arminian doctrine of *totally and finally* falling from grace? It rather makes for the opposite doctrine of *final perseverance*: since the "*reformatio legum*," by only declaring that the justified may *fall into sin* (which nobody denies, but enthusiasts) and that *sin is sin*, let who will commit it (which every man in his senses allows); *Cranmer* and his brother-commissioners, by going no farther, but letting the matter rest here, tacitly set their seal to the "perpetuity of a regenerate man's estate:" according to the known axiom, that *exceptio probat regulam in non exceptis*.

With regard to what you advance from *Latimer*, [page 75], from *Hooper* [page 76], and from *Kidley*, [page 78], it helps not your cause a jot. I had, in my rough draught of these papers, prepared a *vindication* of these venerable prelates and reformers from the slander of Arminianism, which you have, so unjustly, laboured to fasten upon them; together with a *refutation* of the forced, unnatural inferences, deduced by you from the few mangled citations you bring. I find, however, that the insertion of this would swell the present publication beyond the size I intend; and shall therefore *postpone* submitting *that* part of my work to the world, until I see whether you *still* have the hardness to *persist* in charging those Protestant worthies with opinions they detested. If I might take the liberty of advising you, I would recommend to you at least *silence* upon *that* head, in time to come.—I am clear, that you endeavoured to cull out the most unguarded passages, you could, from the writings of the above excellent men: in order, if possible, to set a grace upon your new doctrines, by the sanction of their venerable names. In doing this, you have no more than followed the precedent set you by Dr. *Peter Heylin**, an absolute creature of Archbishop *Laud*, and an obsequious

* A man of fine natural talents, and great acquired knowledge; but who, unhappily, prostituted *both*, to the most execrable of all pur-

obsequious tool in the persecuting hand of arbitrary power. His *Quinquarticular History* is the most laboured effort, ever yet made, to father Arminianism on the church

purposes, The advancement of civil and religious slavery. Long enough before he wrote the *History of the Reformation*, and the *History of the Presbyterians* (which were more properly *libels* upon both;) he gave an early specimen, of what was to be expected from him, in the year 1627, when he publickly maintained, in the divinity-School at Oxford, that *the church CANNOT ERR*, and that the perpetual *visibilty* of the true church, *à retrò*, was to be proved, “ Not from the “ persecuted Christians dispersed in several places, as the *Berengarians* in Italy, the *Waldenses* in France, the *Wickliffites* in England, and “ the *Hussites* in Bohemia; he rather chose to find out (says the writer “ of his life, page 6.) a continual visible church in Asia, Ethiopia, “ Greece, Italy, yea and ROME itself;” and concluded his disputation with passing some very high compliments on the *Romish church*, and on *Bellarmino* in particular: for which the learned (a) Dr. *Prideaux*, who then presided in the divinity chair, had the honesty and the courage to call *Heylin*, publickly and on the spot, *Papicola & Bel-larminianus*. Heylin, who well knew what high designs were then carrying on at court, thought he had now laid the foundations of his fortune: and, flushed with hopes of preferment, posts up to London, to (b) acquaint *Laud*, then Bishop of Bath and Wells, with the meritorious services he had just done, by openly maintaining popish positions in a Protestant university. “ The good Bishop, (says the aforesaid biographer, page 7.) “ commended and encouraged Mr. Heylin; saying, that he himself, had, in his younger days, maintained the same “ positions in a disputation in St. John’s college (c).” Presently after, *Heylin* is made chaplain to *Charles I.*, and prebendary of *Westminster*. On the coming out of Mr. *Prynne*’s *HISTRIOMASTIX* (written, as the title imports, against *plays* and *stage-players*,) *Heylin* is sent for to the council table, where he received the King’s commands to read over that book, and to select such passages from it, as the administration could lay hold of: for, the Queen being, it seems (like a true daughter of France), excessively fond of *plays* and *masques*; an attempt to prove those diversions unchristian, must needs, forsooth, be *traiterous* and *seditious*, and an insult on the *Queen herself*.—A fortnight’s space was allowed our Christian divine, for the performance of this honourable task. But, says his life-writer, “ He had learnt, that diligence in business would qualify him for the service of kings; and “ therefore he finished what was required of him, in less than FOUR “ DAYS: for which he had his majesty’s thanks; as also new com-

(a) Concerning this excellent person, see the Biogr. Dict.

(b) See a curious account of the interview, Life of *Laud*, p. 166, 167.

(c) See two other propositions, maintained by *Laud*’s Life, p. 49.

church of England : but all his attempts are like throwing straw against a fort, or playing water against a rock. The Calvinism, both of our reformers, and of
our

" *mands to revise his papers, and to write down such LOGICAL INFERENCES, as might naturally arise from the premises of Mr. Prynne.*" *ib.* p. 10. The plain English of this is, that Mr. Prynne's own positions, as they stood in his book (though, no doubt, the most exceptionable of them had been industriously culled out by the worthy divine), did not amount to a foundation for prosecuting the author : therefore the same reverend hand was to draw out such *logical inferences*, as might effectually do Prynne's business. With this also the court-chaplain complied. Nor did he stop here : for his historian adds, " About this time, and upon this occasion, he wrote a small tract, touching the punishments due by *law* and in point of *practice*," [a distinction well suited to the proceedings of that arbitrary reign, when *law* and *practice* were two very different things] " unto such offenders as Mr. Prynne : and this was observable, in the trial of that person, that nothing was urged by the counsel to AGGRAVATE his faults, than what was contained in Mr. Heylin's collection." A circumstance, to be sure, much to the Rev. Mr. Heylin's credit ; who yet, by the bye, had the modesty to fall foul on the memory of Calvin, for the part that reformer is supposed to have borne in the prosecution of *Servetus* (d).

About two years before all this bustle, Mr. Prynne had published a learned and masterly performance, entitled *Anti-arminianism* ; proving, that the *Arminian doctrines*, then almost fresh imported from *Holland* (e), were not the doctrines of the church of England, but novel and exotic. This gravel'd *Laud* ; who, not being able to overthrow that vast chain of proofs brought by Prynne ; and yet being resolved, by all the allurements of *promotion*, and (if these failed) by all the terrors of *persecution*, to new-model the church, by lopping off Calvinism, and grafting Arminianism in its room ; greedily laid hold on the subsequent publication of the *Histriomastix* : by the help of *logical inferences* from which the bishop, and his under-strapper Heylin, procured the prosecution of this incorrigible Protestant : who was sentenced in the *Star-Chamber*, to have his book burnt by the hangman—To be, himself, expelled from Lincoln's Inn ; disabled, for ever, to act as a lawyer ; degraded from his university degree ; set twice on the pillory ; have his ears cut off ; be imprisoned for life : and fined in 5000 *l.* a moiety whereof, very probably, went to Mr. Heylin, for

(d) Heylin's Character, of this learned and harmless book, is very curious ; *L. Laud*, p. 217.

(e) Heylin owns this ; *Life of Laud*, p. 122. The Arminians afraid to trust the discussion of their doctrines to the Convocation ; *ibid* 146, 147. The king's edict therefore was to do the business.

his

our church, stands unimpeached, for any thing that either you, Sir, or your Heylin, have proved to the contrary. However, supposing (not granting) that you

his dexterity in drawing logical inferences, and for his activity in publishing a treatise (before the trial came on), setting forth the punishments which, the court expected, should be inflicted on *such offenders as Mr. Prynne*. But, whether Heylin came in for any of the 5000 *l.* or not; the author of his life, immediately after the passage last quoted from him, adds: "For the reward of which, and other good services, that, with wonderful prudence, as well as diligence, he faithfully performed; his majesty was graciously pleased to requite him, by bestowing on him the parsonage of *Houghton*, in the bishoprick of *Durham*, which, afterwards, he exchanged with Dr. *Marshall*, for the parsonage of *Alresford*, in *Hampshire*, that was about the same value: to which exchange he was commanded by his majesty, that he might live nearer the court for readiness to do his majesty's service:" [and *Laudable* service, it was, if we may judge of the whole by the sample.] "neither was he envied for this, or his other preferments, because every one knew his MERITS the only cause of his promotion." *ib.* And so much for Heylin, and his merits: some of which, I suppose, consisted in being a pandour for popery: several of his books, but especially his *History of the Reformation*, having been the means, it is believed (says the life-writer, p. 24, 25.) of perverting "some persons, and those of the most illustrious quality, from the Protestant faith to popery: after which is added the following passage from Bishop *Burnet*, who observes, that Dr. Heylin "*delivers many things in such a manner, and so strangely, that one would think he had been secretly set on to it by those of the church of Rome: though I doubt not* (says the Bishop) *but he was a sincere Protestant, but violently carried away by some particular conceits.*" To which the biographer's answer is this, page 25. "If it be true that any have embraced the Roman faith, by means of that book; (*f*) he [*Burnet*] may conclude them to be very incompetent judges in the matters of religion, that will be prevailed upon, to change it, by the perusal of one single history." A very flimsy vindication from so heavy a charge! See Heylin's life, prefixed to his miscellaneous Tracts, in fol. 1681.

I thought the reader would not be displeased to see a sketch of that man's character, whose name and writings are still so precious in the estimation of high-flown Arminians and Terys. I shall only prolong this large note with one observation more: viz. What can we think of the *Protestantism* of that clergyman, who has left it on record, as his settled opinion, that the death of King Edward VI. (though succeeded by the butcheries of a popish reign) was rather a *benefit*, than

(*f*) The Dutchess of York turn'd papist by reading it. *Echard.*

a detri-

you even had so far made good your point, as to have evinced, that some of our reformers were not altogether such consistent Calvinists, as yet their works prove them to have been; still this argument would not have been decisive. Not the *sermons and private writings*, even of our reformers themselves, are to be taken for authentic tests of our *established* doctrines as a CHURCH: but those STUBBORN THINGS, called ARTICLES and HOMILIES; which have received the sanction of law, and the stamp of public authority. These *stubborn things* (for such they are) still remain, blessed be God, to STARE some certain folks in the face, and to demonstrate the glaring apostacy of such as *say they are Jews, and are not, but are found liars*. To these stubborn things we are to appeal: by *these* every subscriber is bound, and from *these* our doctrines must be learnt.

Before we quit the reign of King Edward, I must advert to what you deliver (page 89), concerning Bishop Ponet's Catechism: which you find yourself under the necessity of confessing to have been "*set forth by the command of King Edward VI.*" This Dr. Ponet, or rather Poynt, was, in 1550, translated, from the see of Rochester, to Winchester, upon the deprivation of that ecclesiastical butcher, Stephen Gardiner. In the year 1553 came out, cum privilegio, two editions, one in Latin, the other in English, of this excellent prelate's Catechism: In which form of sound words (clearly exhibiting the sense both of the church

a detriment, to the church of England? yet this says Heylin. His words are, "Scarce had they brought it to this pass, when king Edward died: whose death I cannot reckon for an infelicity to the church of England; for, being ill-principled in himself, and easily inclined to embrace such counsels as were offered to him, it is not to be thought, &c." Hist. Ref. Pref. p. 4. This Protestant history was dedicated, by the Protestant Doctor, to his Protestant Majesty King Charles the Second: to whom, the above mentioned Protestant remark could not fail of being peculiarly pleasing.

Such was the man, whom Dr. Norwell has ventured to commend, and to quote. I fancy, that by this time, the reader will think, with me, that Dr. Norwell (like Charles the 1st, whom he is not ashamed to *file The best of Kings*) is rather unhappy in the choice of his favourites, and

and legislature), those doctrines, which you have presumed to brand for Calvinistic and Methodistical, are asserted, explained, and enforced. You, indeed, tell us, that "*The free-agency of man is not there denied.*" The word free-agency, is not mentioned: but the thing is denied peremptorily, in the Arminian sense of it: for thus runs part of the Catechism; "From the same SPIRIT also cometh our sanctification, the love of God and of our neighbour, justice and uprightness of life. Finally, to say all in summe, WHATEVER is in us, or may be done of us, honest, true, pure, and good; that ALTOGETHER springeth out of this most pleasant rock, from this most plenteous fountain, the goodness, love, CHOICE and UNCHANGEABLE PURPOSE of God; he is the cause; the rest are the fruits and effects." You add, that, in this Catechism "*universal redemption is not denied.*" Nor is the baptism of bells. Were we to go by your negative rule of interpretation, there would be no end to chicanery, absurdities, and mistakes. This I know, and this you know, if you ever cast your eye on the performance now under consideration, that, in it, eternal, personal, gratuitous and irreverfible election is asserted: from whence a limited redemption necessarily follows: unless you will suppose, that, in the judgment of the church, the will of God the Father, and the will of God the Redeemer, were discordant; and that the latter exceeded his commission, by dying for more than the former gave him in charge to save. But, on the contrary, the Catechism before us evidently restrains redemption to the Elect of God (whether rightly, or wrongly, is not the present question: I am only proving a fact), who are thus described: "Immortality and blessed life God hath provided for his chosen, before the foundations of the world, were laid." And again, that, through the alone benefit of Christ's sacrifice and cross, "All the sins of all BELIEVERS, from the beginning of the world, are pardoned, by the sole mercy of God." The
grace

grace by which men are made true *believers*, and which is the very root of all real sanctification, is farther represented as the special gift and work of the Holy Ghost; "The Holy Ghost is called holy, not only for his own holiness, but because the Elect of God and the members of Christ are made holy by him." Now, if they only, who should *believe*, were redeemed by Christ's sacrifice; and if their *belief* itself be a part of that sanctification which is wrought by the Holy Ghost; and if this sanctification is peculiar to the *Elect* of God; then, according to this Catechism, only the Elect of God were redeemed by Christ.— You tell us, moreover, referring to this valuable monument of good old church-doctrine, "*Nor is the indefectibility of the Elect asserted.*" Indeed but it is, in terms tantamount. The witnessing Spirit of Christ, in the hearts of those who are there styled "*The fore-chosen, predestinate, and appointed to everlasting life before the world was made,*" is expressly termed the "*Author, earnest, and UNFAILABLE pledge of their faith.*" But, was that faith either totally or finally *amissible*, the pledge, by which it is ascertained, could not be called *unfailable*: for, that *faith itself* must necessarily be unfailable, which has an *unfailable pledge*. Besides, God the Holy Spirit could not, with any sort of truth or propriety, be THE EARNEST of their inheritance, if the inheritance itself was precarious, and suspended on conditions of uncertain performance. An *earnest* is actually a *part of payment*, and so much of the inheritance *advanced before-hand*, and which *ensures* the remainder: otherwise, it would be no *earnest* at all. An argument, in favour of the saint's final perseverance, which I defy all the *Excusi-fidians* in the world (as Bp. Hall, no less justly, than smartly, terms them) to answer.

You say too little, when you tell us, that this Catechism "*speaks in pretty high terms of election and pre-destination.*" It speaks of those doctrines in terms the highest and the strongest: as also of *original Sin*; the

the utter *impotence of man's will*, by nature, in spiritual things; the *eternity and immutability of God's decrees*; the *absolute freeness of justification*; and the *efficaciousness* of divine grace, by which (as the very words are) "we are MADE to do those good works, which God had APPOINTED for us to walk in." I shall only add one or two very remarkable particulars, concerning this excellent Catechism. 1. It was published the very *next year* after the framing and setting forth of our church articles: and therefore may be considered as a professed explication and enlargement of them. 2. I have good reason to believe, that, during the short remainder of King *Edward's* reign, it was usually *prefixed to and bound up with* those articles. 3. It was prefaced by the King himself, with an *authoritative epistle of recommendation*, strictly enjoining and commanding, "All schoolmasters whatsoever, within his dominions, as they did reverence his authority, and would avoid his royal displeasure, to teach this Catechism, diligently and carefully, in all and every their schools, THAT SO THE YOUTH OF THE KINGDOM MIGHT BE SETTLED IN THE GROUNDS OF TRUE RELIGION, and furthered in God's worship."—I think, it is sufficiently plain, that *Arminianism* had no footing in the church of England, while headed by our English *JOSIAH*. Which, I presume, was the chief reason that made your beloved *Peter Heylin* impudently term this excellent young monarch (the first Protestant King we ever had) *ILL-PRINCIPLED*.

Come we now to the reign of *Queen Elizabeth*. Under this great princess, the church of England raised its head again, and matters went happily on in the old, Protestant, Calvinistic channel. Of this, many and ample proofs might be given. I shall offer a very decisive one, upon the authority of the worthy and laborious *Mr. Strype*: an historian, whose attachment to our church was indisputable, and whose faithfulness in relating facts, even when those facts make against his own favourite opinions (for he appears

appears to have been an *Arminian*), is equally remarkable and praise-worthy. "We are to know," says this respectable annalist, "that, among those who now profess the gospel, there were considerable numbers, DIFFERING FROM THE REST, that followed some foreign divines, of great name, in the point of predestination; denying the doctrine of God's being any cause of the sins of men, and thereby of their damnation. One of these was *Thomas Talbot*, parson of *St. Mary Magdalen, Milk-street, London*. Those of this persuasion were MIGHTILY CRIED OUT AGAINST, by the other, as FREE-WILLERS, *Pelagians, Papists, Anabaptists*, and the like: but they took their opportunity to address the bishops; plainly declaring their opinions, and their sufferings, as well as others, for the gospel; and desiring therefore the favour of some *act of parliament*, to enjoy the liberty of their consciences, without restraint or punishment (which some threatened), as others of the Queen's Protestant subjects did. I meet" [adds Mr. *Strype*] "with such a petition to the church, the exact time whereof does not appear: but it being evident, it was near the beginning of the Queen's reign, and while a parliament was sitting, I venture to place it here," [i. e. under the year 1562, the very year that our *articles of religion* were revised and re-established, as we now have them]. The petition, says Mr. *Strype*, "was exhibited by the fore-said *Talbot*." After which, he gives us the petition itself, at full length; (see *Strype's Annals* of the first twelve years of Q. Eliz. chap. xxviii. p. 293—296). The petition represents, that the grand point, wherein the petitioners differed from the other Protestants, was, their holding "that God does fore-know and predestinate all good and goodness, but doth ONLY fore-know, and NOT predestinate, any evil, wickedness, or sin, in any behalf." For thus thinking, they complained, that they were "Esteemed and taken of their brethren THE PROTESTANTS, for fautors of false religion; and are
" constrained,

“ constrained, hitherto, to sustain at their hands, daily;
 “ the SHAMEFUL REPROACH and INFAMY of FRE-
 “ WILL-MEN, Pelagians, Papists, Epicures, Anabaptists,
 “ and enemies to God’s holy predestination and provi-
 “ dence; with other such-like OPPROBRIOUS words; and
 “ threatnings of such-like, or as great, punishments and
 “ corrections, as upon any of the aforesaid ERRORS and
 “ SECTS is meet and due to be executed.” —Then the
 petitioners intreat, that they may enjoy their opinion,
 of God’s not being the predestinator of evil, “ Without
 “ any prejudice or suspicion, to be had towards them, of
 “ the OPPROBRIOUS INFAMY of such HERETICAL names
 “ above-named:” And, That none of those corrections,
 “ punishments, and executions, which the clergy hath in
 “ their authority already, and hereafter, by the authority
 “ of this present parliament, from henceforth shall have
 “ in their authority, to exercise upon any of the aforesaid
 “ ERRORS and SECTS, or any other; shall in no wise ex-
 “ tend to be executed upon any manner of person, or persons,
 “ as do hold of predestination as is above declared:
 “ except it be duly proved, that the same person or persons,
 “ do, by their expresse words or writings, affirm or main-
 “ tain that man, of his own natural power, is able to
 “ think, will, or work, of himself, ANY thing that should,
 “ IN ANY CASE, HELP or SERVE TOWARDS HIS OWN
 “ SALVATION, or ANY PART thereof.

From all which, I conclude as follows: 1. That,
 on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, the church of
 England was re-established upon the old Calvinistic
 bottom, on which King Edward had left it. 2. That
 our Protestant bishops and clergy were then more high-
 ly Calvinistic, than, perhaps, the scriptures will war-
 rant: as holding, that God was the Author both of man’s
 sin and damnation. 3. That, nevertheless, those per-
 sons, who did not hold this, were looked upon as dif-
 fering from the rest of our Protestant church-men. 4.
 That our English divines did, in general, carry their
 notions of God’s decrees to this great length: parson
 Talbot and his followers being expressly said to have
 imbibed

imbibed their qualified notions of predestination from FOREIGN divines. That part, therefore, of the present fashionable system, which would exempt moral and penal evil from falling under God's decree, is not of English, but of foreign growth. 5. Those who held this opinion, of God's not being any cause of sin and damnation, were, at that time, mightily cried out against, by the main body of our reformed church, as *fau-
tors of false religion*. 6. That FREE-WILL-MEN were ranked among *Pelagians, Papists, Epicures, Anabaptists,* and *enemies to God's holy predestination and providence*. 7. That, to be called a FREE-WILL-MAN, was looked upon as a *shameful reproach and opprobrious infamy*: yea, that a person, so termed, was deemed HERETICAL, and that the doctrine and abettors of *free-will*, were numbered among those ERRORS and SECTS, which called for the correction of the civil magistrate. 8. That the opposers of predestination were then a good deal *more modest*, than they are at present. The parson of *Milk-street*, who was agent for the rest, only requested an *act of toleration*, for himself and his brethren: which demonstrated a consciousness of their differing from the church established. 9. As those sort of people were then more *modest*, so they were much *more orthodox*, than the modern Arminians. The Semi-pelagians of Queen *Elizabeth's* reign, were, as we have seen, very ready to consent, that any ecclesiastical or civil penalty should be levied on those who should, "By their express words, or writings, affirm, and maintain, that man, of his own natural power, is able to think, will, or work of himself, any thing that should in any case help or serve towards his own salvation; or any part thereof." Where is the Arminian now, who would make such a concession as this? nay, Where is now the Arminian, who does not stily maintain the very reverse? From whence I infer, that our new Anti-calvinists are as much *degenerated* from their *fore-fathers*; as those *fore-fathers* degenerated from the purity of the

D Protestant

Protestant faith in general, and from that of our own national church in particular.

Every man, who has eyes to read, must see, that, at the restoration of the church of England, under Queen *Elizabeth*, the church was *Calvinistic*, as to doctrinals. Else, where had been either the *necessity*, or the *propriety*, of presenting such a petition as this, craving liberty and indulgence to those, who differed from the heads of the church, *only* in not believing the absolute predestination of evil? Nothing can be more evident, than that the bishops and clergy, to whom that petition was addressed, believed the predestination of *all* actions and events whatever, *evil* as well as good; otherwise, the petitioners would never have thought themselves in danger for *not* believing it.

Page 79, you enter on an *academical transaction*, of a very different kind from that in which you have been recently concerned. I mean, the *expulsion* (for such it virtually was) of the reverend Mr. *William Barrett*, fellow of *Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge*, from that university, in the year 1595, for *not* being a *Calvinist*. This gentleman, in a sermon, preached at *St. Mary's*, for his degree of bachelor in divinity, had the courage to deny the doctrines of *assurance of salvation*; the certainty of a true believer's *final perseverance*; and the eternity and unconditionality of *reprobation*: interlarding his harangue, with fierce invectives against *Calvin, Beza, Zanchy*, and other great lights of the Protestant church. This sermon was preached *April 29**. On the 5th of *May* following, *Barrett* was summoned before the *consistory of doctors*, where a solemn *recantation* was enjoined him; which he read publicly, in the same pulpit of *St. Mary's*, *May 10*.—For this, you tell us, "*We have the authority of that loyal and godly author, Mr. Prynne.*" Whether Mr. Prynne was really a godly man, or only such in pretence (which your irony seems to insinuate); must be left to the decision of The Judge who cannot err. But, as to Mr. Prynne's *loyalty*, suffer

* For the process against him, see *Strype's Life of Whitgift*, p. 436.
me

me to remind you, Sir, that true loyalty extends to one's *country*, as well as to the *prince*: and that to oppose tyranny, is no *breach* of loyalty, but an essential *branch* of it. Loyalty (as the very word imports) is *such an attachment*, to King and people, *as is founded on the LAWS*: and an hair's breadth beyond LAW, true LOYALTY does not go. So *allegiance* is obedience, *Ad legem*, ACCORDING TO LAW. Whenever, therefore (as was eminently the case in Mr. Prynne's time), a prince oversteps *law*, loyalty itself obliges a loyal people to say to such a prince, as the Almighty to the sea, "*Hitherto shalt thou come, and no further*,"*—With regard to the authority of Mr. Prynne's *Anti-Arminianism*, the treatise wherein Barrett's recantation of his Arminian errors is recorded; please to remember, that the treatise was published, little more than thirty years after the affair happened: and, had a tittle of Mr. Prynne's account been untrue, there were enough living, who both remembered the fact, and could very easily have refuted our *loyal and godly author*.†—However, the matter is very far from depending entirely on Mr. Prynne's testimony. He refers his reader [*Anti-Arm.* p. 66.] to Bishop Carlton's "*Examination of Montague's Appeal*;" and to Brown's Appendix to the "*Life of Queen Elizabeth*." He moreover gives us the recantation, in *Latin*, as it was delivered; transcribed from the original copy in Barrett's own hand-writing: which Latin copy, he tells us, differs from his English translation of it, only in this one respect; namely, that so much of our 17th article, as relates immediately to predestina-

* Besides, Prynne was a loyal man, even in Dr. Nowell's sense of the word. He was devotedly attached to the interest of Charles II. and, for that reason, was excluded from the House of Commons in the year 1661. Charles himself, ungrateful as he naturally and generally was, was yet so sensible of his obligations to Mr. Prynne, that, on his restoration, he made him keeper of the records in the tower, a place worth 500*l.* per ann. which he enjoyed till his death, which happened in the year 1669. See the Biographical Dictionary. See also Heylin's *Life of Laud*, p. 149.

† Strype himself appeals to Prynne's testimony, as unexceptionable and valid. *Life of Whitgift*, p. 436.

tion, and is but *mentioned* in the English, was *inserted* in Barrett's *own* copy, and recited by him at full length, when he was forced to unravel his web at St. Mary's.—The industrious Mr. *Fuller*, in his *History of Cambridge*, gives the same account, in all material points, with Mr. *Prynne*, of Barrett's recantation; which having set down at large, he thus concludes: "This recantation was, " by the doctors, peremptorily enjoined him; That, " on the *Saturday* following, immediately after the *clerum*, he should go up into the pulpit of St. Mary's " (where he had published these errors), and there, " openly, and in the face of the university, read and " make this recantation; which by him was done according to, " cordingly, but *not with that remorse and humility, as was expected*: For, after the reading thereof, he concluded thus, hæc dixi; as if all had been oral, rather " than cordial*. Yea, soon after, he departed the university; got beyond sea; turned *PAPIST*; returned " into *England*; where he led a lay-man's life until the " day of his death." [Hist. Cambr. p. 151.] But I have yet another authority to alledge. The great and famous Dr. *John Edwards*, who flourished in the reigns of King *William* and Queen *Anne*, and was both a member of the university of *Cambridge*, and one of its brightest ornaments; informs us, that there is a *manuscript*, preserved in the library of *Trinity-college, Cambridge*, which puts the certainty of Barrett's recantation beyond all doubt. The Doctor's words are; " More of this nature, relating to Mr. *Barrett's* case, " may be seen in that valuable *manuscript, which is kept in Trinity-college Library*, which MS. Mr. *Strype*, in " his life of *Whitgift*, very often appeals to. And" [adds the Doctor] " from this excellent collection, may " be confuted that groundless suggestion and conceit " of *Heylin*, in his *Quinqu. Hist.* that Barrett did not " recant: for here it is recorded at length; and several " copies of his own" [i. e. *Barrett's*] " Letters, do " expressly own as much." *Veritas Redux*, p. 535.

* See *Strype*, *ibid*, p. 436, 437, and 444.

For my own part, I cannot say, that I approve the method of obliging any person to make a forced, pretended recantation of what he really believes to be true. It is a very high species of *persecution*; and calculated, not to work *conviction*, but to make men *hypocrites*. Besides, as a writer, of the first abilities, observes, "The arbitrary imposition of opinions naturally creates a reluctance to the reception of them: and as in the collision of bodies, so of minds, the *repelling* force is equal to that which impels." But still, the fact proves the university to have been *Calvinists* in judgment: otherwise, they would never have inflicted censures on one of their own body, purely for broaching *Arminian* doctrines. Part of the very letter, which *you yourself* quote (written, on this occasion, by the *Cambridge* divines, to Archbishop *Whitgift*), renders my assertion indubitable: wherein the university observe to that prelate, that *Barrett* had advanced untruths "Against the religion of our church, PUBLICLY RECEIVED, and ALWAYS HELD in her Majesty's reign, and maintained in All sermons, disputations, and lectures*."—I own, Sir, it must be peculiarly grating to you, to be confronted with such an academical act as this: but, I suppose, you comfort yourself with

Tempora mutantur, nos & mutamur in illis.

Yet remember, that, though *men* and *fashions* may vary, *truth* does not: and what was church of England doctrine, in Queen Elizabeth's reign, is so still. You need not be informed who it is that says, *Veritati nemo præscribere potest: non spatia temporum; non patrocinia personarum; non privilegium regionum.*"

Next come the celebrated *Lambeth articles*. These you labour, with all your might, to depreciate: and good reason why; because the testimony, they bear, to the avowed Calvinism of the prelates, and other eminent clergymen, who agreed upon them, is too glaring and full to the point. I shall give some ac-

* See also, *Strype*, p. 446.

count of these famous articles, in the words of an historian already referred to, whose *signal opportunities of information*, and, above all, whose *transparent integrity*, entitle him to the esteem of all parties. "Now also" began some opinions about predestination, free-will, "perseverance, &c. much to trouble both the schools and pulpit:" [i. e. in the year 1595.] "whereupon, Archbishop *Whitgift*, out of his Christian care to propagate the *truth*, and suppress the *opposite errors*, caused a solemn meeting of many grave and learned divines, at LAMBETH: where, besides the Archbishop, *Richard-Bancroft*, Bishop of London; *Richard Vaughan*, Bishop elect of Bangor; *Humphry Tindal*, Dean of Ely; Doctor *Whitaker*, Queen's professor in Cambridge; and others; were assembled. These, after a SERIOUS DEBATE, and MATURE DELIBERATION, resolved, at last, on the now following articles:

"1. Deus, ab æterno, prædestinavit quosdam ad vitam: quosdam reprobavit ad mortem.

God, from eternity, hath predestinated certain men unto life: certain men he hath reprobated unto death.

2. Causa movens, aut efficiens, prædestinationis ad vitam, non est prævisio fidei, perseverantiæ, aut bonorum operum; aut ullius rei, quæ insit in personis prædestinatis: sed sola voluntas beneplaciti Dei.

The moving, or efficient cause of predestination unto life, is not the foresight of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of any thing that is in the persons predestinated; but only the good will and pleasure of God.

3. Prædestinatorum præfinitus et certus est numerus; qui nec augeri, nec minui potest.

There is pre-determined a certain number of the predestinate, which can neither be augmented, nor diminished.

4. Qui non sunt prædestinati ad salutem, necessariò, propter peccata sua, damnabuntur.

Those, who are not predestinated to salvation, shall necessarily be damned for their sins.

5. Vera,

5. Vera, viva, et justificans fides, et spiritus Dei justificantis, non extinguitur, non excidit, non evanescit, in Electis, aut finalitèr, aut totalitèr.

A true, living, and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God justifying, is not extinguished, falleth not away, vanisheth not away, in the Elect, either finally or totally.

6 Homo verè fidelis, id est, fide justificante præditus, certus est, plerophoriâ fidei, de remissione peccatorum suorum, et salute sempiternâ suâ per Christum.

A man truly faithful, that is, such an one who is endued with justifying faith, is certain, with the full assurance of faith, of the remission of his sins, and of his everlasting salvation by Christ.

7. Gratia salutaris non tribuitur, non communicatur, non conceditur universis hominibus, quâ servari possint si velint.

Saving grace is not given, is not communicated, is not granted to all men, by which they may be saved if they will.

8. Nemo potest venire ad Christum, nisi datum ei fuerit, et nisi Pater eum traxerit: et omnes homines non trahuntur à Patre, ut veniant ad Filium.

No man can come unto Christ, except it shall be given unto him, and unless the Father shall draw him: and all men are not drawn by the Father, that they may come to the Son.

9. Non est positum in arbitrio, aut potestate unius cujusque hominis servari.

It is not in the will or power of every one to be saved."

FULLER'S Church Hist. b. ix. p. 229.

After which, our historian gives us the letter, sent by Dr. Matthew Hutton, Archbishop of York, to his brother of Canterbury, testifying his concurrence with, and approbation of, the above articles.

Your grand, fundamental objection, Sir, to these articles, is, your *hatred* of the doctrines, they contain. This is the *worm*, that lies at the root of your exceptions.

1. You tell us (page 82.) that "*They are no part of our faith.*" You should have said, of your own faith.

I am sorry for it. I am sure they *ought*. 2. They were never "*Established by any legal authority*." I answer, with FULLER, "That, as *medals* of gold and "silver, though they will not pass, in payment, for "current coin, yet will go, with goldsmiths, for as "much as they are in weight; so, though these articles" are not, as that historian observes, "*Provincial acts*, "yet will they be readily received, of orthodox Christians, as far as their own purity bears conformity to "God's word:—and will be taken as witnesses beyond "exception; whose testimony is an infallible evidence, "what was the general and received doctrine of "England, in that age, about the fore-named controversies," (Fuller, *ib.* p. 232.)—3. You add, "They are urged against us by the author of THE CONFESSORIAL." What if they are? Does that in the least impair their value? I am only concerned, that any, who now call themselves members of our church, should, by deserting her principles, lay themselves open to the scoffs of such authors. —4. "They "gave great offence, not only in the university, but at "court." Offence they could not give, to the university; except only to a few heterodox individuals, whose innovating tenets were in danger of public suppression, by counter decisions so clear and peremptory.—Whether or no they gave any real offence *at court*, is questionable. But, if they even did, it can be no matter of wonder, to those, who consider the character of Queen Elizabeth, and how tenderly jealous * she was of her own supremacy in ecclesiastical matters. The articles had been transmitted to Cambridge, without her leave: which alone had been enough to displease a monarch of less haughtiness than Elizabeth; who was too much her father's own daughter, and too tenacious of her prerogative, to smile on any measures that had not received the previous sanction of her approbation. For the same reason, that Archbishop Whitgift is said to have

* See Heylin's *Life of Land*, p. 194.

resented* the university proceedings against Barrett (observe he did not resent their condemnation of Barrett's tenets, for of these the Archbishop openly avowed his detestation, (see *Strype*, p. 447.) as much as they; but their presuming to proceed judicially against that innovator, by virtue of their own sole authority and without first consulting with their metropolitan.† For the same reason, *mutatis mutandis*), Elizabeth herself resented, if it be true that she *did* resent, the subsequent proceedings of *Whitgift*. At all events this is certain, that her extreme affection for that prelate, did not suffer her resentment to

* This gave occasion to that excellent Letter of apology, sent to the Archbishop from *Cambridge*: for which, see *Strype's Whitgift*, p. 437. Barrett, had been before-hand with the university, in writing to the Archbishop; which artful expedient, did at first prejudice the prelate in his favour. See *Strype*, p. 438. Conscious, however, of the badness of his cause, he began to trim, and to eat up part of his assertions. See *Strype's Appendix to Whitgift*, p. 188.

† See *Strype*, ib. p. 440. And in this, the university certainly acted imprudently; *Whitgift* being then at the head of the ecclesiastical commission, and also having a peculiar jurisdiction over *Cambridge*, pro tempore; the see of *Ely* being then vacant. In short, the dispute between the Archbishop and the University, was little else but a mere struggle for power. The heads at *Cambridge* were, at last, apprehensive, that in their scuffle with the Archbishop, concerning the extent of his jurisdiction over them, the truths of religion might eventually suffer; wherefore they present to him a very respectfull, but very nervous, petition: which see in *Strype*, p. 451.

Soon after, Barrett was, by the Archbishop's order, strictly examined at *Cambridge*, upon these eight questions; which, with his answers, see in *Strype*, p. 452, 453. Then examined again at *Lambeth*, before the Archbishop in person, p. 457; and another form of recantation (more moderate and qualified than that he had before delivered at *St. Mary's*) was drawn up at *Lambeth*, with Barrett's consent, and transmitted to *Cambridge*; but which, however, this prevaricating Pelagian delayed to make, p. 457, 458. The whole affair is summed up by the Archbishop himself, as follows; and is such a proof of this prelate's Calvinism, as must for ever leave it incontestible, p. 458, 459.

Here, properly, come in the *Lambeth* articles; p. 461, which were sent to *Cambridge*, accompanied with a letter from the Archbishop, which breathes the true spirit of a Christian and a Protestant, p. 462: yet was he firmly persuaded of the truth of the doctrine asserted in these articles, p. 463. See *Sand. Pax. Eccles.* p. 64.

proceed

proceed far, or to continue long.* One *Corvinus*, a noted *Dutch* Arminian, in a book of his, published beyond sea, seems to have been at the first who made public mention of the Queen's displeasure at this supposed invasion of her prerogative. Concerning the degree of credit due to this foreign writer, who affected to know more of our *English* affairs, than the *English* themselves; let us hear the candid and judicious historian last cited: "As for *Corvinus*, as we know not whence he had this intelligence, so we find no just ground for what he reporteth, [viz.] That Archbishop *Whitgift*, for his pains incurred the Queen's displeasure, and a *præmunire*. We presume this foreigner better acquainted with the imperial law, and local customs of *Holland*, than with our municipal statutes, and the nature of a *præmunire*. Indeed, there goes a *tradition*, that the Queen should, in merriment, say jestingly to the Archbishop, *My Lord, I now shall want no money; for, I am informed, all your goods are forfeited to me, by your calling a council without my consent*: but how much of truth herein, God knows. And be it referred to our learned in the law, whether, without danger of such a censure, the two Archbishops, by virtue of their place, had not an implicit leave from the Queen, to assemble divines, for the clearing, declaring, and asserting of difficult truths, provided they innovate or alter nothing in matters of religion." [FULLER, p. 232.]†

As to *Lord Burleigh's* supposed disapprobation of the articles, I apprehend it is nothing to the purpose, even admitting it to be true.‡ That great person was

* See *Strype*, p. 464. She was, however, enraged at *Baroe's* impudence in presuming to preach against the Calvinistic doctrines, as we shall presently see.

† A *Cambridge* divine, so low down as 1634, was stopt of his degree, for seeming to nibble at the doctrine of justification by faith only.

See *USHER's* Letters, p. 470.

‡ 'Tis extremely questionable whether he did quite dislike them. See *Strype*, p. 464.

certainly

certainly a very able *statesman*; but it does not therefore follow that he was a *good divine*. The famous Mr. *Wilkes*, is, in the opinion of very many, a passable politician; yet I question whether you yourself (though, like you, he is far enough from being a *Calvinist*) would venture to pronounce that gentleman a consummate theologist.

In consequence of these articles, approved of at *Lambeth*, and from thence sent to *Cambridge*, Peter Baroe, D. D. and Margaret-professor, chose rather to quit the university, than either to relinquish his Arminianism, or profess himself a Calvinist when he was not so. The matter is thus related by FULLER: "The end of Dr. Peter Baroe's triennial lectures began to draw near. Now, though custom had made such courtesy almost become a due, to continue the same professor, where no urgent reasons to the contrary were alledged; yet the university intended not to re-elect him for the place: meaning fairly to cut him off at the just joint (which would be the less pain and shame unto him), when his three years should be expired. He himself was sensible thereof; and besides, he saw the articles of *Lambeth*, lately sent to the university; and foresaw, that subscription thereunto should be expected from, yea, imposed on him; to which he could not condescend, and therefore chose to quit his place. So that, his departure was not his free act, out of voluntary election; but that whereunto his will was necessarily determined: witness his own return, to a friend enquiring of him the cause of his withdrawing; "Fulgio," saith he, "ne fugarar;" I fly for fear of being driven away. Some conceive this, hard measure, to one of Dr. Baroe's qualifications: for, 1. He was a foreigner, a Frenchman; 2. He was a great scholar, &c.—Others alledged, that, in such cases of conscience, there lies no plea for courtesy; and that Baroe, as he was a stranger, had brought in strange doctrines, to the infecting the university, the fountain of learn-

ing

ing and religion: and therefore Archbishop Whitgift designed the removing," [or, as Dr. NOWELL would have termed it, the *Amotion*] "of him from his place." [*Hist. of Camb.* sect. vii. p. 21, 22.]*

I shall subjoin the account given by Dr. EDWARDS, of these celebrated *Lambeth articles*: who, after setting them down, as I have cited them above, adds: "The Archbishop of Canterbury, in the letter to the vice-chancellor of the university, when he sent Dr. Tindal and Dr. Whitaker back from *Lambeth* with these articles, professed, That he thought them to be true, and correspondent to the doctrine profest in the church of England, and established by the laws of the land. And again, in his letter to Dr. Nevil, master of Trinity-college, he asserts the propositions to be undoubtedly true, and not to be denied of any sound divine. MATTHEW HUTTON, Archbishop of York, in the close of his letter to Archbishop Whitgift, adds these words, 'Hæ theses ex sacris literis, vel apertè colligi, vel necessariâ consecutione deduci possint, et ex scriptis Augustini.' h. e. These positions may plainly be gathered out of the sacred scriptures, or by necessary consequence may be deduced out of them and St. Augustine's writings†. —John [Young], Bishop of Rochester, in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, allowed of all the articles but one: 'I am something doubtful,' saith he, of the fourth proposition, because, I do not perfectly understand it: for the rest, I have no manner of scruple.' The determination of Dr. Launcelot Andrews, concerning these articles, is also set down in the Trinity-college manuscript, whence I had the foregoing informations. He [Bishop Andrews] agrees with the Archbishop, as to the main; and submits his judg-

* The Queen was enraged with *Baroe*, for his impudence and ingratitude, shown in his presuming to preach against the Calvinistical doctrines; *Strype*, p. 464, 465, and so was the Archbishop, who was *Hutton*, Archbishop of York, p. 476. The articles, for which this French semi-pelagian was accused, were chiefly four; *Strype*, p. 470.

† See *Hutton's* judgment, more fully, in *Strype*, p. 461 and 478.

" ment to the censure of that prelate. There like-
 " wise we have Dr. Bisse's opinion of the propositions;
 " wherein he fully gives his suffrage in their behalf,
 " and distinctly sets it down according to the order of
 " the propositions. This, and the other particular
 " testimonies, may be seen in that fore-mentioned
 " manuscript; which is a standing confutation of those
 " false things that are told by Dr. Heylin, concerning
 " the *articles of Lambeth*: and, particularly, of that
 " calumny, which another of the same genius hath had
 " the confidence to publish to the world, namely, * that
 " Archbishop WHITGIFT *did not in the least approve of*
 " *the theses*, but yet subscribed to them *out of facility*
 " *and fear of discord* †. The contrary manifestly ap-
 " pears from that choice collection of papers which I
 " have made use of, and which was *compiled by the*
 " *Archbishop himself*, or by his order; so as it may
 " be looked upon as his: which I gather from the
 " manuscript itself; it being bound up in a leather
 " cover, on which are the arms belonging to the
 " Archbishop's see.—From the whole, we may con-
 " clude what was the judgment of the prelates and
 " other divines of the church of England, in Queen
 " Elizabeth's time, concerning those high points. Yea,
 " indeed, the conclusion is made to our hand; for
 " the force of truth hath drawn this acknowledgment
 " from one of our chief adversaries, that, in those
 " times, ' *Predestination, and the points depending there-*
 " *upon were received as the established doctrines of the*
 " *church of England* : ' [Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 51.]
 " And again, ' *The books of CALVIN were the rule,*
 " *by which all men were to square their writings: his*
 " *only word, like the ipse dixit of Pythagoras, was*
 " *admitted for the sole canon to which they were to frame*
 " *and conform their judgements.* ' He adds, ' *It was*
 " *safer for any man, in those times, to have been looked*

* Strype also vindicates the Archbishop from this mean insinuation
 of Elis's, p. 462.

† J. Elis Hist. Artic. Lamb.

"upon as an Heathen or Publican, than an Anti-calvinist:" [ibid. p. 52.] *Veritas Redux*, p. 537, 538.

It will appear, Sir, even to yourself, how greatly mistaken you are, in asserting, so confidently, That the Lambeth articles gave offence in the university; when you consider *the letter* sent, by the university, to their *chancellor*, the Lord *Burleigh*, within four months after those articles had been agreed upon at *Lambeth*. We have it at length, in *Heylin's Quinquarticular History*, part iii. chap. xxii. and, I dare believe, this writer has been very careful not to give it in *stronger* terms than it was written: an historian, of his bigotted complexion, is more likely to have *castrated* such a monument of *Cambridge Calvinism*, than added to its vigor. However, in this letter, even as preserved by him, I find the following passages.

"The peace of this university
 "and church being brought into peril, by the late reviv-
 "ing of NEW OPINIONS and troublesome controversies
 "among us, hath urged us, in regard of the places we
 "here sustain, not only to be careful for the suppressing
 "the same, to our power; but also to give your lordship
 "further information hereof. — About a year past
 " (among divers others, who here attempted to preach
 " NEW AND STRANGE OPINIONS IN RELIGION), one Mr.
 " Barrett, more boldly than the rest, did preach divers
 " POPISH ERRORS in St. Mary's; — with whose fact and
 " opinions, your lordship was made acquainted by Dr. Some,
 " the deputy vice-chancellor. Hereby offence and division
 " growing; as after, by Dr. Baroe's public lectures and
 " determinations in the schools, contrary to Dr. Whitaker's
 " and THE SOUND, RECEIVED TRUTH EVER SINCE
 " HER MAJESTY'S REIGN, we sent up to London, BY
 " COMMON CONSENT, in November last, Dr. Tyndal and
 " Dr. Whitaker (men especially chosen for that purpose)
 " for conference with my Lord of Canterbury, and other
 " principal divines there: that, the controversies being
 " examined, and the truth by their consents confirmed; the

* See another concession of *Heylin's*. *Life of Laud*, p. 121.

contrary

"contrary errors and contentions thereabouts might the
 "rather cease. By whose good travel, with sound consent
 "in truth, such advice and care was taken, by certain pro-
 "positions" [i. e. the Lambeth articles,] "containing
 "certain SUBSTANTIAL POINTS OF RELIGION taught and
 "received in this university and church, during the time
 "of her majesty's reign, and CONSENTED UNTO, and
 "published BY THE BEST APPROVED DIVINES BOTH
 "AT HOME AND ABROAD; for the maintaining of
 "the truth and peace of the church: as thereby we
 "enjoyed here great and comfortable quiet, until Dr.
 "Baroe (in January last, in his sermon ad clerum, in
 "St. Mary's, contrary to restraint and commandment
 "from the vice-chancellor and the heads), by renewing
 "again these opinions, disturbed our peace; whereby his
 "adherents and disciples were and are too much embold-
 "ened to maintain FALSE DOCTRINE, to the corrupting
 "and disturbing of this university, and the church, if it
 "be not in time effectually prevented.—Now, unless we
 "should be careless of maintaining the truth of religion
 "established, we cannot (being resolved and confirmed in
 "the truth of the long professed and received doctrine) but
 "continue to use all good means, and seek at your lord-
 "ship's hands some effectual remedy hereof: lest, by per-
 "mitting passage to these errors, the whole body of popery
 "should, by little and little, break in upon us, to the over-
 "throw of our religion.—As we find, by late experience
 "it hath dangerously began." Such were the ideas,
 which the university then entertained, of those Armi-
 nian errors, which have since grown so rampant among
 us*!

Presently after giving us the public letter, from
 whence I have extracted the above passages, this very
 Heylin has the impudence to call Arminianism, *The ge-
 nuine doctrine of the church*. And yet he dates the rise of

* How the university of Oxford also stood affected as to these
 points, is evident from the manner in which they treated Laud. See
 his Life. p. 50.

this

this genuine doctrine, from the time he there treats of, viz. the year 1595; and acknowledges, in effect, that *Calvinism* was the doctrine universally received in our church, until then. His words are, "Such was the condition of affairs at *Cambridge*, at the expiring of the year 1595; the genuine doctrine of the church" [by which he means *Arminianism*, propagated by *Barrett*, *Baroe*, and *Harsnet*] "BEGINNING THEN to break through the clouds of *Calvinism*, where with it was BEFORE obscured." Yet he seems to lament, that *Arminianism* made so slow a progress at that time: for he adds, that there were some still left "of the OLD predestination-leaven." Strange, that the church of England should be without her genuine doctrines, for the first fifty years after her establishment! I should rather have thought, that the *Arminian* doctrines, which, by the confession of *Heylin* himself, did not begin to break through the clouds of *Calvinism* until the church was half a century old, must, for that very reason, be looked upon as new and adventitious: and that, on the other hand, the OLD predestination-leaven, which met with no considerable opposition until the year 1595, was and must have been the truly genuine doctrine of our English church.

You next advert to the ever memorable SYNOD OF DORT, held in the reign of *James I.** which renowned assembly, and its decisions, have always been as great an eye-sore to *Arminians*, as ever the council and creed of *Nice* were to the *Arians*, or *Geneva* to his holiness of *Rome*. That the decrees, past in this synod, are not binding in *England*, is what I never knew so much as questioned. All that we refer to it for, is, to prove, that our national church was not then *Arminianized*: as appears from the character and principles of those *English clergymen*, who, as representatives of the church of *England*, were sent over to *Holland*, to assist the foreign churches in the solemn condemnation and proscription

* *James's* view [in his share of the business] was, to condemn *Arminianism*; *Heylin's* *Life of Laud*, p. 120.

of the Arminian doctrines.—This important convention was at *Dort*, where the synod (composed of the flower of the reformed churches) was opened, *Nov. 13, 1618*. Of all the councils that ever sat, since the Apostle's days, this was, perhaps, taking every thing into the account, by far the most respectable. Scarce ever, I believe, did the Christian world, before or since, see such a number of evangelical divines, so learned, so pious, so discreet, so candid, assembled together under one roof.—The English divines, who made so eminent a figure in this synod, and whose orthodoxy, learning, and great abilities reflected so much honour on our church and nation; were, *GEORGE CARLTON, D. D.* then Lord Bishop of *Landaff*, afterwards of *Chichester*: *JOSEPH HALL, D. D.* then Dean of *Worcester*; afterwards, successively, Bishop of *Exeter*, and *Norwich*: *JOHN DAVENANT, D. D.* then *Margaret professor*, and master of *Queen's College, Cambridge*; afterwards Bishop of *Salisbury*: and *SAMUEL WARD, D. D.* then master of *Sidney-College, Cambridge*, and Arch-Deacon of *Taunton*. To these was soon after added, as representative of the church of *Scotland*, *GEORGE BALCANQUALL, B. D.* and fellow of *Pembroke-Hall*. *Dr. HALL*, after about two month's stay in *Holland*, was forced, by want of health, to return to England (having first taken a most respectful and tenderly affectionate leave of the Synod, in a pious and elegant speech, still extant:) and was re-placed by *THOMAS GOADE, D. D.* chaplain to the Archbishop of *Canterbury*. That these great divines, who represented our church with such fidelity and ability, were, *every one of them*, DOCTRINAL CALVINISTS, the reader may see for himself, by consulting the *acts and memorials of the Synod*, published at *Dort*, A. D. 1620, where the *determinations* of our English divines, their *speeches*, and their *subscriptions*, stand on record, and prove how deeply and how inexcusably *we*, in the present day, are revolted from our *first love*, and degenerated from our *first faith*.

I will not call the *Arminian* writers (as *Bp. Bull*, not

very politely, did the *Arians*) “mendacissimum genus hominum,” a most lying set of men; but I cannot, without doing violence to truth, acquit them, in general, of *artifice* and *wilful misrepresentation*, hardly compatible with *Heathen honesty*, and still less with *Christian integrity*, when they treat of doctrines and transactions relative to Calvinism. Even you, Sir, do not seem to have quite escaped the ungenerous infection. Hence you venture to assure the world, page 92, That “It was indeed in great measure owing to the heats and violence with which matters were carried in that synod, and the great severity of the HORRIBLE DECREES” [a phrase you have apparently borrowed from Mr. John Wesley] “here framed, that our English divines, who attended that synod, begun to have less reverence for the doctrines of CALVIN.” If ever there was a mistake, in the world, this is one. I, as an individual of that Public to whom you have submitted your pamphlet, have a right to call upon you for *proof* of this confident assertion. Bring forth your strong reasons, or the world will be at full liberty to draw conclusions not to your advantage.*

Never were debates, of such intricacy and importance, carried on with more decency, solemnity, and unanimity, than in this synod. The *Arminians* (who were cited to answer for themselves, as corruptors of the church and disturbers of the state), did, indeed, endeavour, all they could, to embarrass and throw matters into confusion; and never did the chicanery and insolence of the *remonstrant sect* more palpably appear, than at that period. These *mushroom-schismatics* were in hopes, by raising a dust, to elude the censures they justly dreaded; and to catch some advantage to themselves, by striving to occasion divisions in the synod: thus exactly treading in the steps of *their good friends and cousin-germans, the Papists*; who, ever since the first dawn of the Reformation, have acted on the same plan, and

* Here might have been introduced the judgment of these divines at the Synod, from the acts of it.

with

with the same views.—But the venerable *Dordracene fathers* saw the drift of the Arminian faction; and happily defeated its wishes, by standing together like a chain of rocks, which neither fraud nor force could shake or sever.—Nor were the divines of *England* staggered in their judgments, upon their return hither from *Dort*, concerning either the justice and moderation of the synod's proceedings, or the orthodoxy of its decisions: as may, if need require, be easily and largely demonstrated from the writings of *Hall, Carlton, Davenant, &c.* published long enough afterwards. I therefore call, once more on Dr. *Nowell*, as he is a clergyman and a man of honour, either to *prove*, or to *retract*, what he has (I would hope, *unadvisedly*) advanced.

Nor can I wholly pretermit your next paragraph; wherein you assure us, that the learned Mr. *Hales* went to *DORT* “*a rigid Calvinist; but there I bid John Calvin good night, said he to his friend Mr. Faringdon.*” The learned Mr. *Hales* both was, and continued, a Calvinist: as appears from that very book, to which Mr. *Faringdon's* letter is prefixed. Yet, if he had changed his judgment ever so greatly (which, by the bye, he never did, if *his * own subsequent writings* are allowed to have the casting vote); still, That would not affect *The Church of England*. He did not go to *Dort*, invested with any public commission or character from this kingdom, but merely as a private person†. However, since you affect to lay so much weight on *the pretended change* of this learned man, I will subjoin what the famous Dr. *Edwards* delivers on the subject: “The sentiments of Mr. *Hales*, of *Eton-College*, who was present at the synod of *Dort*, may be here inserted; for though some tell us, that, when *Episcopus* urged, John iii. 16. this Mr. *Hales* ‘*Bid John Calvin*

* See his *Golden Remains, passim*.

† He went to *Holland*, in capacity of chaplain to Sir *Dudley Carlton*, *James's* ambassador to the States. Hence he came to be present at the Synod of *Dort*, held at that time. Biogr. Dict. vol. 6. p. 279.

“ *good night,*’ yet it is likely he was reconciled to
 “ him *next morning*: for his writings, that are since
 “ extant, give us the best account of his opinions.
 “ He expressly acknowledges *The purpose of God’s elec-*
 “ *tion,* and *The purpose of God’s reprobation,* in a ser-
 “ mon on Matt. xxvi. 75. And, in another sermon,
 “ *xxxiv. 1.* he tells us, That *Some with favourable*
 “ *countenance of scripture, make the cause of reprobation,*
 “ *only the will of God, determining freely of his own work,*
 “ *as himself pleases, without respect to any second cause*
 “ *whatsoever.* He owns, that *This doctrine may be pro-*
 “ *fitably taught and heard, and that matter of singular*
 “ *exhortation may be drawn from it.* And he adds, *It*
 “ *is a noble resolution, so to humble ourselves, under the*
 “ *hand of the Almighty God, as that we can with patience*
 “ *bear, yea, think it an honour, that so base creatures as*
 “ *ourselves, should become the instruments of the glory of*
 “ *so great a Majesty, whether it be by eternal life, or by*
 “ *eternal death; though for no other reason, but for God’s*
 “ *good-will and pleasure’s sake.* This is very high, and
 “ more than I have ventured to say: but thence we
 “ may gather what kindness this great man had for
 “ Calvin’s opinions; yea, for *That* which is the most
 “ exceptionable of all: and how averse he was to Ar-
 “ minius’s System of Divinity.*

“ And it is to be observed, that Mr. Hales’s book,
 “ wherein these passages are, is commended to the
 “ reader by two excellent divines of our church; Dr.
 “ PEARSON (afterwards Bishop of Chester), and Mr.
 “ Faringdon: who were well skilled in these points.
 “ Which puts me in mind [N. B.] of what the *former*
 “ of these learned men told me, when he was pleased
 “ to admit me to some discourse with him; namely,
 “ That ‘ *when he* [Bishop PEARSON] *was a young master*
 “ *of arts, he thought there was no difficulty in these grand*
 “ *articles [of predestination, &c.]; ‘ that he was able to*
 “ *determine any of them with ease, especially on the Ar-*

* The very poets of that and the preceding times, were Calvinists.
 See Spenser, Shakespear, Waller, Quarles.

“minians’ side: BUT, since, he found it was otherwise;
 “and he disapproved of men’s rash censuring and condemn-
 “ing the OTHER SIDE: and, indeed, we may guess this
 “to be his inclination, by his approving of Mr. Hales’s
 “remains.” Verit. Red, p. 542, 543. Of all the Eng-
 lish clergymen, who assisted in the synod of Dort, the
 great and good Bishop HALL was the longest survivor.
 The Arminian fanatic, John Goodwin (in his libel on
 the Protestant doctrines, entitled, “Redemption Re-
 “deemed,” published during the usurpation) slandered
 the synod with the blackest calumny his malice could
 invent: thinking, that he might safely vend his false-
 hoods, at a time when the far greater part of the persons,
 who composed that apostolical assembly, were gathered
 home to the church triumphant. It was an happiness,
 that we had, however, one excellent man living, who
 was able upon his own knowledge, to wipe off the as-
 persions of this bigotted miscreant. The pious, the
 aged Bishop Hall, upon the coming out of Goodwin’s
 book, wrote a pretty long letter to FULLER, which
 that historian published at full length, in his *Church
 history*, b. 10. p. 85. I wish I had room to transcribe
 the whole: but it concludes thus, “Since I have lived
 “to see so foul an aspersion cast upon the memory of those
 “WORTHY AND EMINENT DIVINES; I bless God, that
 “I yet live to vindicate them, by this my knowing, clear
 “and assured attestation; which I am ready to second with
 “the solemnest oath, if I shall be thereto required.

“Your most devoted friend, &c.

“Higbarn,
 “Aug. 30, 1651.”

“JOS. HALL, B. N.”

Almost two years after, the same incomparable pre-
 late wrote another letter to the learned Mr. GEORGE
 KENDALL*, upon the same subject. The reader may
 see

* This great man effectually answered John Goodwin’s “Redemp-
 “tion Redeemed,” in two separate treatises: the one entitled, *Θεωπαια*,
 or, a Vindication of the Doctrine commonly received in the reformed Churches,
 concerning God’s Intentions of special Grace and Favour to his Elect, in the

see the whole of it, in Mr. Kendall's *Sancti Sanciti*, published in the Bishop's life time. The latter part of it is as follows: "*My unhappy sickness called me off, before the full conclusion of that work*" [viz. the formal Condemnation of the *Arminians* (called, in *Holland*, *Remonstrants*), by the synod of DORT]: "*But I stayed*

Death of Christ; as also concerning his Prerogative, Power, Prescience, Immutability, &c. Printed 1653. The other, entitled, *SANCTI SANCTI, or, the common Doctrine, of the Perseverance of the Saints vindicated*: published in 1654.—In these two volumes, the doctrines of grace are explained, asserted, and defended, with such solidity of nervous argument — such a display of useful learning — such transparent piety — such pleasing perspicuity — and the whole enlivened with such acumen of wit; as few controversial pieces, written in that age at least, can boast. If, after giving my opinion of this most excellent author, I may, without presumption, subjoin the attestation of the truly primitive Bishop HALL; I would lay before the reader, that most worthy prelate's letter to Mr. Kendall, signifying how greatly he approved, and even admired, the first of the above performances, which the author had made him a present of soon after its publication. A testimony from such an hand, will, at once, enrich this note, give the utmost weight to my recommendation, and both gratify and edify such of my readers, as have not met with it before. The Bishop's letter is affixed to the *Sancti Sanciti*, between the dedication and the preface; and runs, *verbatim*, as follows:

"Worthy Mr. KENDALL,

"I cannot forbear, though with a sick hand, to signify my thankful receipt of your excellent work" [the *Θεομαχία*] "part whereof I had eagerly perused, before your welcome present came; and had desired my sonne to impart unto you my appreciative thoughts concerning it. I easily foresee, how highly you will be tempted with applauses for so acceptable a service. I know I need not, but my tender love of you bids me, desire you, with an humble heart to sing, Non nobis, Domine; but let the whole praise run clear back to that infinite bounty, from whence these precious gifts came. And go on to improve those great parts, to the further honour of the giver.

"With my thankful acceptance of your comfortable letter, and rich present; I take leave: professing myself

"your heartily devoted friend,

"Higbam,
"March 16, 1652."

"and fellow labourer,

"JOS. HALL, B. N."

Is it impossible to read such an apostolical letter, without being charmed with the venerable simplicity, improved by the sweet humility, and warmed with experimental piety, which glow and shine in every sentence?

"J

“ so long as any public session, or appearance of the Re-
 “ monstrants, continued. Thus much, in effect, I have,
 “ formerly, upon the motion of my worthy successor at
 “ Waltham, Mr. Fuller, signified to him; as one who
 “ cannot but think, it was one end of this unexpected pro-
 “ traction of my days, after all the rest of my fellows, that
 “ I might do this right to that GODLY REVEREND
 “ LEARNED ASSEMBLY. With the intimation whereof,
 “ I bid you farewell in the Lord; and do heartily commend
 “ your studies to the Divine Benediction: professing myself,

“ Your loving and

“ Highbam,
 “ July 25, 1653.”

“ much devoted friend,

“ JOS. HALL, B. N.”

When *Arguments* fall short, it is too common with controversial writers to *call names*, and *fling dirt*: in hopes of casting an *odium*, on what they find themselves unable to confute. I could wish, Sir, that you had not stooped to this illiberal recourse: your following expostulation had then been spared; page 93. “ *Consider what faction it was, which then*” [i. e. in the time of Charles I.] “ *prevailed towards the overthrow of the church. Was it not that of the Puritans? And were not the doctrines of Calvinism their leading principles?*” Permit me, Sir, to ask, Were ALL the disturbers of those times Calvinists? Were Charles, and his French Queen; were Laud and Buckingham, CALVINISTS? These were the *primary* disturbers, whose evil counsels, and whose arbitrary measures, laid the sad foundation of those disturbances, which issued in the overthrow of the church. The confusions of that unhappy reign, and the miseries that followed, are to be radically charged, not on those who repressed the haughty strides of despotism; but on the *Despots* themselves, whose violent proceedings rendered that opposition absolutely necessary. Matters, at last, were wound up to that fatal height, that both sides found themselves reduced to the dismal necessity of going to much greater lengths, than either of them fore-

saw at first setting out. On one hand, there was a Court equally *despotic* and *corrupt*, and (as the event proved) no less *feeble*, than *proud* and *unyielding*. On the other there was *patriotic zeal*, gradually enflamed into *party-rage*, by a long series of repeated insults and unrelenting oppressions. No wonder, therefore, that, under the confluence of such circumstances, the constitution received that eventual subversion, which *you*, either through forgetfulness of history, or by disingenuous misrepresentation, would, untruly, and ridiculously, charge on the *Calvinism* of that age.

As *Charles* * and his court were far enough from inclining to the *Geneva* doctrines; so likewise were some, who, though they agreed with that unfortunate prince, as an *Arminian*, yet detested and resisted his measures, as a *tyrant*, and even publicly justified the putting him to death. Witness *John Goodwin* † that virulent Anti-Calvinist, who wrote an elaborate treatise, in professed vindication of *King Charles's* murder, under the title of

* There is indeed, a book extant, published in 1651, entitled, "CERTAMEN RELIGIOSUM, or a conference between the late King of England, and the Lord Marquiss of Worcester, concerning religion." It is written with great poignancy, clearness, and learning; and contains a most excellent defence of the protestant faith; especially of those branches of it, which now go under the name of *Calvinism*. Could the authenticity of this masterly performance be satisfactorily ascertained, it would effectually overthrow my supposition, of *Charles's* attachment to *Arminianism*. If he can be really thought to have borne that part in the conference, which this treatise represents; he did indeed, literally, merit the title of *Defensor Fidei*: and must have been as sound a Protestant, as ever lived; and as strenuous a Calvinist, as any Puritan in his whole dominions.—But the book bears the signatures of a much finer genius, and of far more extensive learning, than *Charles* seems to have possessed: though his abilities were by no means inconsiderable.—It was evidently written, and fathered upon the king, by some learned churchman, who was a well-wisher to his memory. I have great reason to think, it's author was Archbishop *Usher*, who, certainly, was with the king, at *Ragland*, at the time the conference is said to have been held. See *Parr's Life of Usher*.

† For some account of this *Arminian* fanatic, See Bishop *Burnet's* Own Times, vol. i. p. 67, and 163. folio, and *Ant. Wood* in several places.

“ Ade-

“ *A defence of the Sentence, passed on the late King, by the High Court of Justice.*” This was the same *John Goodwin*, who, about the same time, published his *Redemption Redeemed*; that infamous libel on the doctrines of the reformation: wherein he endeavours, throughout, to prove CALVIN, and all the *Reformed Churches*, in the wrong, and asserts *universal redemption, free-will, justification by works, and falling from grace*, not quite so smoothly, but altogether as tenaciously, as you yourself have done, or as the authors of your admired Popish book, the *Pia et Catholica Institutio*. — Add to this (and deny it, if you can), that those execrable enthusiasts, who were the chief authors of *Charles’s* execution, were not *Calvinistic Divines* * (for these were so far from approving of the King’s murder, that they offered a *petition* against it), but a *rabble army*; composed of the dregs of almost every sect, and particularly, of *Papists* in disguise. † — With regard to the *Puritans*, properly so called, many of whom had *previously* made a stand against the despotism, arrogated by that misguided King and his delinquent ministers; *these* (the Puritans), to their credit be it said, joined with those of the *Episcopalians* who were undissembling lovers of the church and of their country, in warding off the slavery, which it was the endeavour of an infatuated court to obtrude: whence all, whether churchmen or dissenters, who were engaged in this noblest of causes, were lumped together, and stigmatized, indiscriminately with the name of *State Puritans*. The friends of liberty and the constitution, stood up in defence of both, not merely as *Calvinists*, but as *Englishmen*. What concern, for instance, had the doctrines of *efficacious grace*, and *final perseverance*, in the just opposition that was made to *ship-money*, *Star-chamber prosecutions*, and

* Very many Calvinists were on *Charles’s* side: as *Usher*, *Hopkins*, *Hall*, &c.

† See Bishop *Bramhall’s* letter to Archbishop *Usher*. *Usher’s Life*, p. 611. See also *Calamy’s Abridgement of Baxter*, vol. i. and *Voltaire’s Universal History*, vol. iv.

ten thousand other intolerable grievances? Let me request you, Sir, as you tender your own credit, to *think* before you write, and weigh matters with some degree of care. Had you done this lately, you had not attempted to palm such absurdities on the public. —I must add, That the history of *Charles's* and the two preceding reigns, makes it undeniable, that those of the Puritans, who were *non-conformists*, did not dissent from our church in *doctrinal matters*, but, solely, in the matter of *rites and ceremonies*. And what had this *partial* dissent to do with the doctrine of *predestination*, in which the main body, both of Conformists and Non-conformists, were reciprocally *agreed*? It is notorious, that the latter had their name, not for disbelieving our *doctrinal articles* (which was never, that I can find, so much as laid to their charge), but for not conforming to our *modes of worship* *. If a *Calvinist*, and a *Non-conformist*, were, as you would unjustly insinuate, convertible names; it would follow, that we must *unchurch our own church*, for the first hundred years after the Reformation, and date its genuine commencement from the introduction of Arminianism under Archbishop *Laud*. That innovating, hot-headed prelate, if your premises are admitted, is to be considered as the *father* and *founder* of the church of England; whereas he was, in reality, its *corruptor*, and its eventual de-

* “ *Albeit the Puritans disquieted our church, about their conceived discipline, yet they never moved any quarrel against the DOCTRINE of our church. Which is well to be observed: for, if they had embraced any doctrine which the church of England denied, they would assuredly have quarrelled about that, as well as they did about the discipline. But it was then the open confession, both of the Bishops and the Puritans, that both parties embraced a mutual consent in doctrine: only the difference was in matter of inconformity. Then hitherto there was no Puritan doctrine, as distinct from that of bishops and clergy, known.*” Upon which passage, quoted from Bishop CARLTON’s *Examination of Montague’s Appeal*, Dr. Edwards makes this obvious remark; “ This is a full confutation of that idle conceit, taken up by so many in our age, that the *Anti-Arminian* doctrines were not the doctrines of our church, of our Bishops, and of the rest of our clergy, but only of a few disciplinarians and non-conformists.” *Veritas Redux*, p. 548.

Stroyer :

Destroyer: for he drove so rapidly towards *Rome*, that he *overset* the church, of which he unhappily held the reins; and was not a little accessory to the concomitant fall of the *state* likewise, which, rushing precipitant, entombed both *his sovereign* and *himself* in its ruins. I will only observe farther, that, even in *the present century*, we have had some *Calvinistic Bishops*. Bishop BEVERIDGE, and Bishop HOPKINS, for instance. And will you call these truly *bright ornaments* of our church, *Sectarists*, *Puritans*, and *Methodists*, because they were *professed Calvinists*?

The farther I advance in your pamphlet, the more my surprize and concern increase. In order to prove, what you call, *The moderation* of our articles, you are not content with *distilling* away and *forcing off* the sense and spirit of the *doctrinal* ones; but would even insinuate, that the necessity of EPISCOPAL ORDINATION ITSELF is not determined in our articles. Treating of article xxiii, you say (page 95.) “ *The compilers were not willing to condemn or unchurch the reformed churches abroad, where episcopacy was not established; and therefore prudently avoided determining the question, whether Episcopal ordination is necessary. Those who hold, and those who deny, the necessity of Episcopal ordination, may both subscribe to this article: those only are condemned by it, who hold, that a man may preach without any lawful vocation. The same moderation the compilers of our articles have observed in the points before us.*” i. e. in the *Calvinistic* ones. I can hardly believe my own eyes. So rather than not expunge *predestination* from our articles, you would expunge with it the necessity of *episcopal ordination*! This is sweeping the church clean indeed. Though the respect, I bear you, forbids me to treat your paragraph and your insinuation in the manner they deserve; yet the still greater respect, which I bear to THE CHURCH, constrains me to hang out the detached paragraph to open view, and leave it to the public indignation. Whoever can persuade himself, that our EPISCOPAL CHURCH does not insist on the necessity of
EPISCOPAL

EPISCOPAL ORDINATION; may well enough believe, when his hand is in, that our *Calvinistic church* has not determined in favour of the *Calvinian doctrines*.——Nor does it follow, that the church of England, in believing, for herself, the necessity of Episcopal ordination; does thereby *unchurch* those of the Reformed churches abroad, which have no bishops, any more than that those churches unchurch *us* for retaining our excellent and primitive mode of ecclesiastical government. National churches, that are independent on each other, have, respectively, an internal right to establish such forms of *regimen*, as to them seem most scriptural and expedient. And this indefeasible right may pass into execution, without any violation of that Christian charity and neighbourly affection, which ought to subsist between churches that agree in the common *faith* of the gospel.——I cannot, however, forbear to repeat the astonishment I feel, that a clergyman of *THIS* church, should, through zeal against the *Geneva doctrines*, make such an unwarrantable concession in favour of the *Geneva discipline*. Who could ever have thought, that an OXFORD-DIVINE, should, and that from the *Clarendon-press*, rather let go the *HIERARCHY*, than give up *free-will*? Oh, tell it not in *Glasgow*! publish it not in the streets of *Edinburgh*! Lest the *Presbyterians* rejoice, and the daughters of *the kirk* triumph.

No wonder, Sir, that, after *this*, you should assert, as follows, concerning grace and *free-agency*. You, indeed, give us to understand, that you do not wholly explode *all* influences of the Holy Spirit, “*But the supernatural, extraordinary, and irresistible influences of the Holy Spirit,*” page 98.——If, by *supernatural, extraordinary, and irresistible*, you mean the *MIRACULOUS* gifts and influences of that adorable person; *Calvinists* as much disclaim all pretension to *these*, as you can do. We believe, that, the end of their vouchsafement, in the primitive ages, being fully answered, by the confirmation of the gospel; the gifts themselves are, long since, ceased: and that no man, who now
makes

makes this claim (if any such mad-man is to be found), can expect to be credited, unless he actually has *miraculous powers* to prove it by.—Yet there is, certainly, a *sober* sense in which ALL the *gracious* influences of the Spirit may, and ought to be, termed, *supernatural*; or, superior to the powers and reach of nature. You will not, surely, assert that the influences of the Spirit are *natural* to fallen man: for that would be setting aside the essential difference, which scripture and reason are so careful to maintain, between *nature* and *grace*. Constant *experience* also, and daily *observation*, confirm the apostle's decision, that “*The NATURAL man receiveth not the things of the SPIRIT of God; neither can he*” even “*know,*” much less receive “*them, because they are spiritually discerned:*” and until the *natural man*, is renewed by *grace*, he has *no spiritual eyes to discern them by*.—In exact conformity to this certain truth, the first exhortation, in our BAPTISMAL OFFICE, hath these words: “*Forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Saviour Christ saith, None can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the HOLY GHOST; I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that, of his bounteous mercy, he will GRANT to this child that thing*” [namely *regeneration*] “*which, BY NATURE, HE CANNOT HAVE.*” It, then, the *new birth*, and the *renovating influences of the Spirit*, are *not natural* to man: they must be *supernaturally* conferred.—The same influences may, in some sense, be safely enough, termed, *extraordinary*; inasmuch as they are *extra ordinem*, or *out of the common course*: for *All* men have them not. But I lay no manner of stress on this remark. Thus much, however, it proves; that the word, so carefully explained, may be used in a rational, harmless sense. Though, for my own part, I always chuse to abstain, as much as possible, from the use of such terms, as are liable to misapprehension, and require a tedious circuit of explanation,

planation. As a great man observes, *Quid hoc malæ rei est, ità ex destinato consilio loqui, ut mox prolixâ explanatione indigeas, apud auditores simplices et candidos; et apologiâ apud minùs faventes ac suspicaces?* I have, therefore, always acquiesced in the usual distinction of the Spirit's influence, into *ordinary* and *extraordinary*: and understand, by the *former*, his supernatural agency in a way of saving grace; by the *latter*, his agency, formerly exerted, in the collation of miraculous gifts.

But I see not so much reason for absolutely cashiering the epithet *irresistible*: though I could wish, that the term *Invincible* (which more exactly conveys our true meaning) were always substituted in its room. *Irresistible* may seem (tho' we intend no such thing) to imply some *compulsive force* on the will of man, in regeneration: whereas, we neither assert, nor believe, that the will is *violently compelled*, but only that it is *effectually CHANGED for the better*, without any violation of its natural freedom. An elect sinner is not *made good, against his will*; but is, by grace, *made willing to be good*: according to that of the psalmist, "*Thy people shall be willing, in the day of thy power,*" Psalm cx. 3. We apprehend this to be effected, as St. *Augustin* expresses it, *suavi omnipotentia & omnipotentia suavitate*: so that, though the *effect* of the Holy Spirit's operation is infallibly secured and cannot but issue in conversion (for he does nothing in vain;) yet is this blessed effect accomplished, in a way suitable to the natural powers wherewith man is endued. By *irresistible*, therefore, if you understand grace that is *efficacious, invincible, and certainly victorious*; we are authorized, both by scripture, reason, and the strictest maxims of philosophy, to term *converting grace* IRRESISTIBLE; since, where God *really designs* to renew a sinner unto righteousness and true holiness, we think it incompatible with every notion of *Deity*, to suppose, that the *intent* of an ALL-WISE Being should be eventually *defeated*, and his *plan disconcerted*; or that the measures made use of by an ALMIGHTY agent, should be *baffled* and *issue in nothing*. Neither can we apprehend, that a deity, of this *infinite*

nite wisdom and infinite power, who is “*excellent in counsel, and mighty in working,*” can ever find himself *at a loss* how to carry his immutable purposes, whether of grace or providence, into execution; or be unable to operate effectually on the wills of men; without *trespassing* on that freedom, of which he himself is the author and giver. Surely, he who, without our consent, made us *reasonable beings*; can, by virtue of his own omnipotently transforming grace, make us *holy beings*! and that without making us mere machines. *He that planted the ear, shall HE not hear? He that made the eye, shall HE not see?* He that endued my will with natural freedom, cannot HE renew this will of mine, without infringement of the freedom he gave?—Time was, when the Christian world did not entertain such *low* thoughts of God, and such lofty thoughts of man, as now too generally prevail. How beautiful, how just, how nervous is that petition, which, *Grotius* * informs us, was a part of the public devotions of some ancient churches! “*Ad te nostras etiam rebelles compelle propitius voluntates:*” *In mercy, force over even our obstreperous wills to thy blessed self.* That fine prayer, of the ascetic *Raymund Jordanus*†, is animated with the same heavenly Spirit of internal humiliation, and absolute submission to sovereign grace: “*Per violentiam tui dulcissimi amoris, compelle rebellem animum meum ad te amandum;*” *By the overpowering virtue of thy sweetest love, constrain my rebellious soul to the love of thee.* O that God would put such a cry, into the heart of the person to whom I am writing! You would THEN, Sir, never more draw your pen against the doctrines of GRACE; but, if reduced to the alternative, you would rather, with *Cranmer*, hold your hand in the flames, until it was consumed from your arm. —I must observe, however, that the holy persons, above-quoted, are not to be understood, as if they

* In Luc. xiv. 23.

† Long known by the borrowed name of *Idiota*. For the prayer, referred to, See his *Contempl*, cap. 5. sect. 3.

imagined,

imagined, that God, in his operations of grace, offered *violence* (properly so called) to the human will; or *compelled* his people to love him, whether they would or no, as an ox was dragged to sacrifice: but the meaning of their supplications was, that he would *effectually incline* and *attach* their wills to HIMSELF; and that the omnipotence of his constraining love would reduce and master their natural obstinacy and perverseness. However, the strong and nervous manner, in which their petitions were expressed, shew what ideas these antient Christians entertained, of the *stubbornness, rebellion,* and depravity of man's will, by nature; and the *almighty* exertion of divine grace, which is requisite to subdue it. The *invincibility* of converting grace, and, at the same time, the immunity of the will from all forcible, involuntary *compulsion*, are very happily expressed in the 10th of those *articles of religion* *, set forth by King Edward VI. “ *The grace of Christ, or the Holy Ghost* “ *which is given by him, doth take from man the heart of* “ *stone, and giveth him an heart of flesh. And though it* “ *rendereth us willing to do these good works, which, before,* “ *we were unwilling to do; and unwilling to do those evil* “ *works, which, before, we did; yet is no violence offered* “ *by it to the will of man: so that no man, when he hath* “ *sinned, can excuse himself, as if he had sinned against his* “ *will, or upon constraint, and therefore that he ought not* “ *to be accused or condemned upon that account.*”

As for the passages of *scripture*, which you have accumulated, as making for your own notions of free-will, conditional grace, &c. and which, having *wrenched* and *detached* from their contexts, you would fain *torture* into a sense which, it is demonstrable, the *inspired writers* never thought of; you will find all those perverted passages, and many others which are no less impertinently *prest* into these controversies by the partizans of *Arminius*; restored to their primitive and obvious meaning in Dr. EDWARDS'S *Veritas Redux*, or in

* See *Heylin's Hist. Reform.* in the Appendix, p. 182.

Dr. GILL's *Cause of God and Truth*. As to the *former* of these valuable books, I cannot find that it was ever attempted to be answered. And, for the *latter*, it has stood unanswered for, I believe, near thirty years; and you, Sir, or any other expert Arminian, would do well to try your skill upon it, if you are able, while the learned and judicious author is detained from Abraham's bosom. But, surely, so long as such capital books, as those, remain in full possession of the field; it is *idle*, to the last degree, for the gentlemen, of your side of the question, to *amuse* themselves, and *trifle* with the public, by letting off *pop-guns*, and throwing paltry *squibs*, at what *they* call CALVINISM.

Speaking of the doctrines of *election* and *reprobation*, you justly observe, that you are "*pressed with the authority of the 17th article*," p. 103. Indeed you are; and preft *hard* too: else you would never have added, as you do in the *next* page, "*The article speaks of a predestination, decreed by God's counsel, secret to us; and to be discerned only by the working of the Spirit of Christ mortifying the works of the flesh: and directs us to receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scripture*." Is it possible that these truly Calvinistic sentences should drop from the pen of a Dr. NOWELL? *O vis veritatis, invitis etiam pectoribus erumpentis!* what a concession is here! You have granted as much as any Calvinistic writer could have granted, or a Calvinistic reader can desire. You are got into the very midst of *Geneva*, before you are aware: a place where I no more expected to have met you, than the *Normans* did, at one time, think of seeing the great Lord CLARENDON at *Roan*.

Nor is your concession weakened a jot, by what you immediately subjoin; "*But there*" [i. e. in scripture], "*we shall find all these promises conditional*." For, 1. ALL the divine promises are *not* conditional: witness that famous one, in which every other spiritual promise is virtually comprized, "*I WILL be their God, and they SHALL be my people*." 2. It does not follow,

low, because some promises seem to run conditionally, i. e. *hypothetically*, that therefore the performance of the conditions themselves is suspended on the free-agency of man. In the distribution of the blessings promised to the Elect, a certain *order* and *economy* are observed. *Grace* is FIRST given; THEN *glory*. Thus we believe and say, with the apostle, that, *without HOLINESS, no man shall see the Lord*: or, that a man must be *sanctified*, before he can be finally *glorified*. God does not eventually *save* an elect person, until he has previously *regenerated* that person. Hence final salvation is frequently, in scripture, held forth to the view of his people, not only under the character of *elect*, but likewise under every other character they sustain; such as *penitents*, *believers*, *saints*, and *workers of righteousness*: because, in consequence of their *predestination* to life, they are endued with the graces of *repentance*, *faith*, and *sanctification*, in order to their *meetness* for and *enjoyment* of that eternal life which they were predestinated to. Regeneration must, and always does, COME BETWEEN the *decree of election*, and the *ultimate accomplishment* of that decree: the MEANS and the END being *inseparably linked together*, both in God's own *purpose*, and his *execution* of it. Yet, *means* are one thing; *conditions* are another. And I challenge any one Arminian, to point out any one spiritual *qualification*, represented, in the Bible, as *previously requisite* to everlasting life; which qualification is not, in the same Bible, declared to be *the gift of God*, and *the work of his own grace* in every one that shall be saved. So much for the *scriptures*.—Next, for our LITURGY. You assert, page 106, that, “*The sentences of scripture, with which the morning and evening prayer are appointed to begin, fully declare the free-will of man.*” They declare neither more nor less than this, that persons, possessed of such and such graces, have an *evidential* right to such and such privileges, by virtue of God's free promises.—You add, “*In the absolution, the priest declares, that Almighty God desireth not the death of a sinner, but ra-*”
“*ther*”

“ *that he may return from his wickedness, and live.*”
 Granted. But *what sort* of sinner is here meant? Let the absolution itself decide. It is such a sinner as belongeth to “HIS PEOPLE,” the people of *Almighty God*; who are farther described under the visible characters of “*them that truly REPENT, and unfeignedly BELIEVE his holy gospel.*” But are ALL sinners partakers of this *true repentance* and *unfeigned faith*? And can you really persuade yourself, that God actually wills the salvation of *those*, in whom these graces are *not* finally wrought? This would be opening a door to licentiousness indeed: nay, it would be a most tremendous misrepresentation of the Deity himself, as if it was possible for him to love the wicked *as* wicked. Surely you will never offer to father such horrid doctrine upon the church of England!—Did *All sinners truly repent and unfeignedly believe*, they would come under the opposite denomination of *saints*. The plain meaning, then, of this declarative absolution, is, That, until *repentance* and *faith* (the two grand constituents of *regeneration*) are wrought in us, and shew forth themselves by the peaceable *fruits of righteousness*; we have no right to look upon ourselves as *pardoned* and *absolved*: but that, when these ARE wrought in us, we have, in the judgment of our church, a safe and scriptural warrant to conclude that we are in a pardoned state. Our reconciliation unto God by the death of his Son, being to be INFERRED *from* and PROVED *by* (though in no sense FOUNDED *upon*), the grace he hath given us, and the good works he enables us to do. And, that the *faith* and *repentance*, which the absolution mentions, were, in the intention of the compilers, considered as the effects of *God's free grace* and NOT of *man's free will*; appears, incontestibly, from a subsequent part of the absolution itself: which runs thus; “Wherefore let us beseech him to GRANT us true repentance and his Holy Spirit; that those things may please him, which we do at this present, and that the rest of our life hereafter may be pure and holy.” But, upon

your principles, in vain we do *pray* for these blessings; since, if your hypothesis be right, we had them *in our own power* BEFORE. Were Arminian *free-willers* to act consistently with their darling tenet, they would never *pray* at all.

As a proof of the church of England's denial of *final perseverance*, you gravely inform us (p. 106.) that, "*In the Lord's Prayer, we petition God not to lead us into temptation.*" A most formidable argument indeed! reduced to some little sort of form, it stands thus;

The church of England hath adopted the *Lord's Prayer* into her public service:

But, in that prayer, we request to be preserved from *temptation*.

ERGO, the church believes, that the truly regenerate may *totally and finally fall from grace*.

Here are premises, without a conclusion; and a conclusion, without premises. For, are *temptation*, and *final apostacy*, terms synonymous? If they ARE, it would follow, that EVERY saint is actually a *final apostate*: because there is *no* saint who is not *tempted* to evil, more or less, every day of his life. If the terms are NOT synonymous, then your inference, drawn from this topic, *falls* to the ground, and *vanishes* into air.

Enter, now, a proof, no less cogent, in behalf of *unlimited redemption*.—"The hymn, called *Te Deum*, "*thus celebrates the universal redemption by the incarnation and death of Christ; 'when thou tookest upon thee to deliver man, thou didst not abhor the virgin's womb: when thou didst overcome the sharpness of death, thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers.'*" (page 107.) The conclusion, you would deduce from hence, must be this, if any:

CHRIST, by the merits of his death, opened the kingdom of heaven to all BELIEVERS.

ERGO, he opened the kingdom of heaven to EVERY INDIVIDUAL OF MANKIND, that ever *did*, that now *does*, or ever *shall* exist.

I could not have expected *such* reasoning, from the
Public

Public Orator of our English Athens. Indeed, Sir, you can never prove, from those two verses of the *TE DEUM*, that our church holds absolutely universal redemption, until you have previously made good these two points: 1. That *all mankind*, not a single individual excepted, are *believers*; and, 2. That *faith* is *NOT* the *gift of God*.—My argument, drawn from this part of that seraphic hymn, stands thus (and I leave to the judgment of the impartial, whether it be not perfectly obvious and unforced):

Our church, in the *TE DEUM*, asserts, That Christ, by his incarnation and death, opened the kingdom of heaven *to all believers*:

But the whole of mankind are *NOT* believers:

Ergo, our church, in the *Te Deum*, does not assert, that Christ opened the kingdom of heaven to the whole of mankind.

Nay, I will go a step farther. The church, in this place, does evidently *limit* redemption, to *only a part* of mankind. For, by saying that Christ opened the kingdom of heaven to *ALL BELIEVERS*; she virtually declares, that he opened heaven to *believers ONLY*: so that, in the judgment of the church, *they alone* were intentionally *redeemed* by Christ, who should finally *believe*. And what is this but the very essence of that innocent, yet much dreaded thing, called *CALVINISM*? in running away from *which*, you plainly run away from *THE CHURCH*. *Ita fugis, ut præter casam*. Still your ammunition is not exhausted: for, in the same page, you hurl another thunderbolt at John Calvin's head: "The suffrages, offered up, by the priest, and all the congregation alternately, are quite inconsistent with the notion of absolute predestination and indefectible assurance: —'Grant us thy salvation'—'Take not thy Holy Spirit from us.'" The suffrages themselves are most excellent: but your inference from them is a mere *telum imbellè sine ictu*. As if prayer (which is one of the very means, by which the end is decreed to be come at)—as if prayer, on man's part, was incompatible with pre-

destination on God's ! So far is his from being true, that the belief of his *immutable purposes* is the very thing which excites, and warrants, effectual fervent prayer, and puts life and confidence into our approaches to the throne of grace. I shall give two remarkable instances of this ; one from *Scripture*, the other from our *Liturgy*.

1. From scripture. *David* having received some gracious intimations of what good things God had decreed to bestow on his family after him ; instead of sitting down idle, and restraining prayer before God, as if *human duty* was superfluous, on the supposition of *divine decrees* ; the holy monarch breaks forth into *supplication* for the very mercies which had been so *peremptorily promised* :—*Thou, O Lord of hosts, God of Israel, hast revealed to thy servant, saying I WILL build thee an house ; THEREFORE hath thy servant found in his heart to PRAY this prayer unto thee,* 2 Sam. vii. 27. It is equally plain, 2. That the compilers of our admirable *liturgy* considered matters in the same view. Those evangelical divines well knew, that God *hath determined the times before appointed* (Acts xvii. 26.) and that *the day of Christ's second coming* is, in particular, *fore-ordained and fixt*, in God's determinate counsel and fore-knowledge (Acts xvii. 31.) " Surely, then," might an Arminian say, " those compilers have not directed us to pray " for the coming of this predestined period." Indeed but they have ; and that on a very solemn occasion, and in these very solemn words : *Humbly beseeching thee of thy gracious goodness shortly to accomplish the number of thine elect, and to hasten thy kingdom**. — PRAYER, therefore, and

* See the *Funeral Office*.—From the petition, cited above, it is undeniable, that, according to the doctrine of the church of England, there is, 1. A body of *elect* persons ; which elect persons are, 2. chosen and elected of God himself ; whence she terms them, *THINE elect*. These elect of God are, 3. a certain, determinate *number* : and this round number will, 4. be *accomplished*, perfected, and made up ; so that not one of *the number* shall be missing : it being a rule that holds good, no less in divinity, than in metaphysics, *sublatâ quâcunque parte, tollitur totum*. Hence, the church, ever consistent with herself, begins one of her collects thus ; " O almighty God, who hast KNIT
" TOGETHER

and the other *means* of grace, are not *superfeded*, but even rendered *needful*, by the certainty of God's *predestination*: for, *Qui vult finem, vult etiam media ad finem*. The manifestation of God's goodness, in the final salvation of his people, being the *end* designed by him in his gracious decree; must necessarily have been *first* in the divine *intention*: but this end, being *last* in actual *execution*, certain correlative *means* must necessarily intervene, in order to carry the divine intention *into* actual execution, and to *connect* the DECREE and the ACCOMPLISHMENT of it *together*. Of these means, prayer is one. Therefore, supposing our church had directed her regenerate members, to pray even in express terms, (which, however, I do not recollect she has) for preservation from total and final apostacy; *that* would not have proved the defectibility of the saints: watchfulness and prayer being *means* of perseverance, no less decreed than *perseverance* itself. Thus the apostle, like a wise master-builder in Sion, joins the *certainty* of perseverance with prayer for it: *The very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it.* 1 Thess. v. 23, 24.

You tell us, p. 107, that some infer the doctrine of ELECTION, from that petition in our liturgy, "*Make thy chosen people joyful.*" They do: and not only, directly, the doctrine of *election*; but, indirectly, that

" TOGETHER thine ELECT into one communion and fellowship in the MYSTICAL BODY of thy Son," &c. And, surely, those whom God hath knit together, can never be put asunder: for *What God doth, it shall be for ever; nothing can be put to it, nor any thing taken from it*, Eccles. iii. 14. — The above Collect is for the festival of *All Saints*. Now, if *all Saints* are thus divinely knit together, and make up the Mediator's *mystical body*; it follows, that *not one true saint* can perish. As not a bone, in Christ's *natural body*, was suffered to be broken; so neither shall his *mystic body* be *maimed*, by the loss of any the meanest member: for the *world of the elect*, collectively taken, constitute the *mystical fullness of him who filleth all in all*, Eph. i. 23. So that, without *every one of THEM*, Christ himself (considered *relatively*, as the head and Saviour of his spiritual body) would not be made perfect.

of assurance likewise. The petition evidently proceeds on this *datum*, that God really had a *chosen people*; and, agreeably to such a belief, beseeches him to make his chosen people *joyful*: i. e. to rejoice them with the comfortable sense and persuasion of their belonging to that *chosen number*. — But you object (*ibid*), that, “*The word chosen, or elect, signifies, in scripture, either all Christians in general, or such Christians as walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called.*” Easily said; but, so far as I have been able to find, never yet proved. Every text, appealed to in your references, demonstrates the very reverse to be true. The word ἐκλεκτός, *elect, chosen*; is evidently, formed from the participle ἐκλελεγμένον, which, as every body knows, signifies *selected, picked out, and chosen from among others*. But I have such an authority to vouch, for this sense of the word, as is infinitely superior even to the natural, proper etymology of the word itself: I mean the authority of no less person than the eternal Son of God; the incarnate Λόγος, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. He surely, if any, both perfectly *knew*, and was able to *fix rightly*, the meaning of this religious term. And how does HE define the word *elect*? In Dr. Nowell’s vague, jejune manner? Quite the contrary. Consult Mark xiii. 20. *And except the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh should be saved: but for the ELECTS’ sakes, WHOM HE HATH CHOSEN, he hath shortened the days.* According therefore to Christ’s own definition, οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ the ELECT, are οἱ ἐκλελεγμένοι, THOSE WHOM HE [the Lord] HATH CHOSEN. Consequently, this important word does NOT signify, either *all professing Christians* at large, nor yet *such Christians as walk worthy of their vocation*. But simply and singly, *the objects of God’s gracious choice*, abstractedly considered as such, without any respect had to aught in them, or done by them, whether actual or foreseen. A cordial profession of Christ, and a *walking worthy of their high calling*, are AFTER-parts of their character; and have no place in the persons chosen, UNTILL, in consequence of their election

election from everlasting, they are *regenerated* and made new creatures in Christ Jesus. As *real conversion* is the FRUIT and RESULT of *predestination*; so holiness of heart and purity of life, are the fruits of real conversion: which is the *immediate* (as election is *the remote*) CAUSE of all the good, that is wrought in us, and that is done by us.—Upon the whole, then, as long as the good old definition of *the elect* remains on record in the above scripture; so long, we obstinate Calvinists must beg leave to reject Dr. Nowell's *new-fangled, vapid* explanation, as utterly inconsistent with the plain, obvious import of *language*, and (which is still worse) as totally counter to the express *determination* of Christ himself.

Your flashing treatment of *scripture-phrases* and *scripture-doctrines*, which you hack and mangle so unmercifully, when they happen to militate with your own preconceived opinions; unhappily realizes but too well that remark of Dr. MIDDLETON; “We may observe,” says this able writer, “How impossible it is, for men, “ even of the greatest learning and piety, to interpret “ scripture with success, when they come to it, pre- “ possessed with systems, which they are listed, as it “ were, to defend. For, instead of SEARCHING, can- “ didly, *the true meaning* of the text; they come pro- “ vided with *senses*, which they are obliged to *ingraft* “ upon it; until, by a practice and habit of wrestling “ the scripture on all occasions, they acquire a dexte- “ rity of extracting *what doctrines they please out of it.*” Miscell. Tracts, p. 12.

The fashion of *explaining away* the word ELECT, by saying it only means *good Christians*, was invented at a pinch, for much the same reason, that people look at *the sun* through a *fumigated glass*; namely, to *diminish* and *obscure* the native lustre of its beams, by the intervention of a *dark, discoloured medium*. Thus some artful Arminians, in order to secure *a majority*, would persuade superficial enquirers (who make up the bulk of mankind) that the word *Elect* does NOT signify *Elect*, but something *very different* from its own meaning.

By

By virtue of which *artificial fumigation*, the *meridian truth* is clouded; and all, who believe *Election* to BE *Election*, are set down for Calvinists, Puritans, Methodists, and low-churchmen: only because they are so *very unmannerly** as not to look at scripture through the Arminian's *dark glass*: which glass has just the same effect on *gospel-truths*, as Dr. HOOKE's *Helioscope* has on the *rays of the sun*; which he tells us, will be so *weakened*, if beheld through that qualifying tube, "as only to strike the eye with a 256th part of their force."

Still, Sir, you harp on the same beloved string; and would fain *fumigate* our CATECHISM, amongst the rest. There the church tells us, that the Holy Ghost *sanctifies all the Elect people of God*: that is, say you, (p. 107.) "All CHRISTIANS, or at least, all GOOD Christians, who are ready to comply with his motions." And can a person of your good sense really believe this to be the meaning of *Elect*? I will not offer you such an affront, as to suppose it. And yet, alas! on the other hand, if you do *not* believe your own interpretation; What becomes of your *integrity*?—"The Holy Ghost sanctifies all good Christians:" so then men must be *good Christians before* they are sanctified: and when they *have* made themselves *good Christians*, then the blessed Spirit sanctifies them. A piece of information, for which the poor, ignorant, Calvinistic Church-of-England men are solely indebted to the labours of Dr. Nowell. I really, before, was so weak as to imagine, with St. Paul, that *goodness* was a *FRUIT of the Spirit*, and a constituent part of sanctification itself: but, now, I perceive *goodness PRECEDES* sanctification; and that the office of the Holy Ghost (I tremble to write it, but let *them* answer for the conclusion, who avow the premises) is, only, to make such people *good* as were *good before*.—Hence you revert once more to *universal Redemption*; which you infer from

* In like manner *Peter* with his tripple hat, kicked his two brothers, *Martin* and *Jack*, out of doors, because they would insist upon it, that a *loaf* was a *loaf*, and could not be a *shoulder of mutton*. See the *Tale of a Tub*.

that

that passage in the Catechism, "Who hath redeemed me and all mankind:" on which your comment is, page 108, "*All those, therefore, whom God the Son hath redeemed, God the Holy Ghost sanctifies.*" Excellent. You now write indeed like a true minister of the church. Not a Calvinist, in the whole world, but would subscribe to this with both hands. But pray, Sir, is *every individual of mankind sanctified by the Holy Ghost*? If the contrary is but too evident, then it follows, from your own positive premises, that every individual of mankind was *not redeemed*: since you justly assert *Redemption* and *Sanctification* to be equilateral and commensurate with each other; "*All those whom God the Son hath redeemed, God the Holy Ghost sanctifies.*" The *All mankind*, therefore, which our church hath declared to be interested in Christ's Redemption; is not to be understood of *every individual*, but of *some of all nations*; even those, and those only, *whom God the Holy Ghost sanctifies*. Thus your own explication of the phrase *All mankind*, exactly comports with the explication of it, which the church herself gives in the very next paragraph—"All the Elect people of God."

I should congratulate you, Sir, on your candour and attention to evidence, did you not immediately recant, and build up the things you had just destroyed. Your whole paragraph stands thus: "*All those, therefore, whom the Son of God hath redeemed, God the Holy Ghost sanctifies; but both only on condition of their own concurrence and compliance with the terms offered.*" The Church of England says no such thing. You have clogged Redemption and Sanctification with dead weights, of your own putting on. There is not a word, in the Catechism, directly, or indirectly, about *concurrence* and *compliance*. Redemption itself is there represented as a finished, peremptory thing; not as a *term* or *condition* TENDERED to man's acceptance; but as a *real price* ACTUALLY PAID DOWN for the ransom of mankind, "God the Son who HATH REDEEMED me, &c." Not, who will redeem me, if I am pliable and concurring; but

but who HATH done it, to *make* me so. Whatever conditional *salvation* may be, a *conditional Redemption* is a contradiction in terms : for either the ransom price is paid, or it is *not*; there is no medium, nor room for any qualifying salvo or draw back. The doctrine of the church, as well as of the scriptures, and of plain common sense, is, that Christ hath, "by the one offering of himself, perfected for ever them that are sanctified," or set apart for God.—Nor is the notion of a *conditional Sanctification* less absurd. I must be either *sanctified* by the Holy Ghost, or not. If I *am*, I comply and concur with him of course, by virtue of that very sanctification which he imparts: if I *am not* sanctified by him, I shall neither concur nor comply; because this concurrence and compliance are a part of sanctification itself, and can have no existence without it.——I blame no man for believing according to the best light of his own judgment, let his faith, to me, seem ever so ill-grounded: but I blame any man who DARES to palm his own *private* notions upon *the church*.

However, by way of canvassing your paragraph as minutely as I am able, and letting it have all the fair play it possibly can, by considering it in every point of view, I will suppose, for once, that both Redemption and Sanctification are conditional. What will you get by it? You will plunge head foremost, *quantus quantus es*, into the *Lake of Geneva*, and come out a *limited Redemptionist*.—A very able writer observes, that all *violent extremes*, how widely remote soever they may seem, have in fact, a common *central point*, to which they mutually verge, and in which they ultimately *coincide*. You yourself, Sir, (with all due respect I dare to speak it) are an instance of the justice of this remark. "God the Son," you tell us, "hath redeemed us only on condition of our concurrence and compliance." We will put the case, that some persons do, eventually, *neither* concur *nor* comply. Such persons were, by your own acknowledgment, *unredeemed*. Therefore, say I, admitting these premises, Redemption is *not universal*; they

they only (according to Dr. Nowell) being *redeemed* by Christ, who “*concur and comply with the terms offered:*” which all do not.

We enter now on a new scene. Prepare thyself, reader, for a fresh discovery: even such a one, as I; for my own part, should never have dreamt of, but for the assistance of *Peter Heylin* and *Dr. Nowell*. — Calvinism, it seems, is downright Popery: and Popery is orthodox Calvinism. But by what *art of transubstantiation* is this proved? The proof follows; page 108, “*The word Elect frequently occurs in the Roman Breviary, the Papists make use of it in their rituals, as well as we: — so that if the use of this word will prove the compilers of our Liturgy Predestinarians; it will prove the church of Rome so too, and that in this respect it is as orthodox as Calvinism itself.*” Not quite so fast, Sir. Let us weigh premises, before we jump to conclusions. The sense of the word *Elect*, as it stands in a *Reformed Liturgy*, is not to be determined by the sense affixed to it in a *Romish Breviary*. Such an insinuation comes with a very ill grace from the pen of a Protestant divine. It would at least have saved appearances, had you referred us, for the sense in which the church of England uses the word *Elect*, to her own 17th article, where she professedly treats of Election; instead of sending us back again into Egypt, to consult *Mass-books* and *Breviaries*. The spouse of Christ is not to learn the meaning of her husband’s language from the mother of abominations. 2. The amount of your observation is this, if I understand it right; “By the word *Elect*, when used by Papists, they do not mean God’s predestinated children, but *All good Catholics*: Ergò, the same word, when used by Protestants, is to be understood as denoting *all good Christians*.” I deny the consequence. Because *Papists* are perverters of language, scripture, common sense and every thing that is good, it does not follow that Protestants should be so too. 3. Neither does it follow, that the *church of Rome* are *predestinarians*, because the word *elect* occurs by chance in their

their public offices. *Popish Priests*, when they mutter out the word *ELECT*, are (like ladies on some occasions) to be understood *by contraries*: in which too many professing Protestants, who ought to know better, are not ashamed to imitate those locusts of the bottomless pit.

In farther opposition to the doctrines of *predestination* and *perseverence*, you appeal to our *baptismal office*. Excellent as that office is, we have had some truly great and good men, who thought it not quite unexceptionable. But, for my own particular part (if I may, without presumption, offer my own judgment), I know not of one syllable in the whole, which does not harmonize with those doctrines. That part of it, on which you seem to lay the greatest stress, is, where the church appears to take the *regeneration* of the *baptized* for granted. From whence *Arminians* would endeavour to infer, that, since many *baptized persons* persist finally in sin, and may be supposed to perish at last, therefore the *regenerate* are not secured from absolute apostacy.—That baptism is a *TYPICAL* regeneration, I grant: as also that it is the *ordinance* of *INITIATION*, whereby a person, whether infant or adult, is *incorporated* into the *visible* church, and entered on the list of Christian professors. From the maturest consideration of what our church has delivered concerning the nature and effect of this sacrament, it appears to me, that, in her judgment, the administration of Baptism is *very frequently* attended with the true, real, renovating influences of the Holy Ghost: which influences being internal, spiritual, and invisible, and consequently not to be discerned by the Baptizer; he is directed to acquaint the bystanders with the *charitable hope* of the church, both in his subsequent address to the sponsors, and in his presumptive thanksgiving to Almighty God. Yet, I can no where find, that the church pretends to *tye* the regenerating grace of the Spirit, to the bare administration of this ordinance: as if that infinitely glorious and absolutely independent Person *always* seconded the good intentions of the church, by invariably

ably crowning that rite with *real regeneration*. The church * of Rome, indeed, bawls out, that every sacrament does, *ipso facto*, confer grace *ex opere operato*, and curses them that will not believe it; as also, that Baptism impresses I know not what *spiritual mark* on the soul, even such a mark as can *never be effaced*: which assertion she likewise arms with a sting in the tail; pronouncing them accursed who deny it. But our own church has nothing like this. On the contrary, she positively defines a Sacrament to be “ *An outward and visible sign of an inward spiritual grace,*” given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a “ *means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.*” She adds, that “ *The outward, visible sign, or form, in Baptism,*” is “ *water, wherein,*” or wherewith, “ *the person is baptized in the name of the Father, &c.*” Baptism itself, therefore, is not regeneration, but a *sign, or type* of it: and is then only a proof of regeneration, when accompanied with “ *the inward and spiritual grace,*” which the church does not affirm it always is. And, indeed, I should wonder if she had; since, if all baptized persons were truly regenerate, *Christendom* would be a much better part of the world than it is. This *inward and spiritual grace*, of which baptism is the sign and figure, is defined by our church to consist in “ *A death unto sin, and a new BIRTH unto righteousness.* For, being, by nature, born “ *in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby [i. e. by inward and spiritual grace, the last immediate antecedent] “made” [constituted and proved to be] “children of grace.”* Exactly coincident with our Catechism, is our 27th article: “ *Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not chris-*

* Si quis dixerit, per ipsa novæ legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, &c. anathema sit. Concil. Trid. Sess. vi. Can. viii.

Si quis dixerit, in tribus sacramentis, baptismo, scilicet, confirmatione, et ordine, non imprimi characterem in animâ, hoc est signum aliquod spirituale et indelibile, &c. anathema sit. Ib. Canon ix.

“ *tened;*

"tened; but it is also a SIGN of regeneration, or new Birth?
 "whereby, as by an INSTRUMENT, they, that receive
 "Baptism rightly, are grafted into the church, &c." I
 conclude from hence, that, in the judgment of the
 church of England, *Baptism* and *internal Regeneration*
 (the former being, simply considered in itself, only a
sign or *symbol* of the latter) are two distinct things;
 which, though they sometimes go together (when the
 Holy Spirit pleases to make Baptism the channel of his
 gracious influences), yet do not necessarily nor constantly
 accompany each other: and, therefore, the subsequent
 apostacy of some baptized persons does not in the least
 (as Bishop Burnet would infer, and you from him) shake
 the doctrine either of *immutable predestination* on God's
 part, or of *infallible perseverance* on the part of the truly
 regenerate. But, you observe, page 109, that, "*With*
 "*regard to infants, the Rubrick declares, It is certain by*
 "*God's word, that children, which are baptized, dying*
 "*before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.*"
 I firmly believe the same. Nay, I believe more. I
 am convinced, that the souls of *All* departed infants
 whatever, whether *baptized* or *unbaptized*, are with God
 in glory. And I think my belief warranted by an au-
 thority which cannot err, Matt. xviii. 14. — You
 have, therefore, no occasion to lug in *children* by head
 and shoulders, page 110, and to ask, with an air of in-
 sult, where then is the "*Doctrine of absolute, irre-*
 "*spective predestination and reprobation, which would*
 "*include children as well as adults?*" I believe, that, in the
 decree of predestination to life, God hath included all
 whom he hath decreed to take away in infancy: and
 that the decree of reprobation has nothing to do with
 them.

Now we come to what you and others of your party
 represent as *monstrum, horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lu-*
men ademptum: I mean, the doctrine of REPROBATION.
 Absolute Reprobation, you say, "*Is no where taught*
 "*in our articles, nor in the scriptures; but just the con-*
 "*trary.*" I, on the other hand, maintain, that it is
 plainly

plainly *implied* in our articles, and expressly *asserted* in the Scriptures. Of the latter I shall say little here: but I cannot, in justice to the church, omit a short proof or two, respecting the former. In doing this, I must really be so unpolite as to hold up the 17th article to you, though I am sensible it is an article you have no great affection for. However, as it has received the sanction of your own solemn subscription, you are bound, both in honour, conscience, and law, to stand or fall by the evidence it brings. “*Predestination to life*” [which implies, on the other hand, a predestination to death; otherwise the article is lame] “*is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby, before the foundations of the world were laid, he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation THOSE* [observe that restrictive word], “*whom he hath CHOSEN in Christ OUT OF mankind,*” [All mankind therefore were not chosen, but some were passed by: for if there was no decretive distinction in God’s Election, the Elect could not be said to be chosen OUT OF mankind] “*and to bring THEM by Christ*” [and not the rest, out of whom they were chosen], “*to everlasting salvation as VESSELS MADE TO HONOUR.*” [There are, therefore, some vessels NOT made unto honour]. In thus asserting everlasting, personal, immutable *Election*; the church, tacitly, indeed, but virtually, and by necessary * consequence, sets her seal to the opposite doctrine of *preterition*: since there can be no *choice*, without a *refusal*; no *election* of some, without a *rejection* of others; no *partial admission*, without a *partial exclusion*. The church, indeed, does not expressly *say* as much; but, from the premises she has laid down, the conclusion follows as unavoidably as if she had: and I defy all the sophistry of man to affirm the premises, without admitting the conclusion. Election, without Reprobation, cannot stand: it must have the other leg, or it will tumble down.—But I recur

* See Heylin’s *Life of Laud*, p. 30. and *Cambr. tracts*, 175.

to the article: and shall begin where I left off. After asserting the decree of predestination unto life, and telling us what it is; the church goes on to affirm, that this decree cannot be *frustrated*, but shall certainly have its *accomplishment*, in the salvation of its objects, at the appointed time, and through the appointed means: “ *Wherefore THEY, which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God*” [namely, with the excellent benefit of God’s Election and Predestination to life], “ *be CALLED*” [and that not with a random call, but] “ *ACCORDING TO GOD’S PURPOSE, by his Spirit working in due season:*” [nor with a precarious, ineffectual call; but with such a spiritual and internal call, as insures the end for which it was vouchsafed; for] “ *They, THROUGH GRACE, OBEY the calling: THEY be justified FREELY: THEY be made sons of God by adoption: THEY be made like the image of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ: THEY walk religiously in good works;*” [not only for a while, but to the end of their days; otherwise it would not be added] “ *and, at length, by God’s mercy, THEY ATTAIN TO EVERLASTING FELICITY:*” [so that they, who do not eventually attain to everlasting felicity, were never in the number of God’s Elect*.]

In the next place, this article proceeds, by way of practical improvement, to point out the most obvious *uses* and *abuses* of the doctrine of Predestination. 1. Its uses. “ *As the godly consideration of Predestination and our election in Christ is [1.] full of SWEET, PLEASANT, and UNSPEAKABLE COMFORT to godly persons, and such as FEEL in themselves THE WORKING OF THE SPIRIT of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things; as well because [2.] it doth GREATLY ESTABLISH and CONFIRM THEIR FAITH of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because [3.] it doth FERVENTLY KINDLE their LOVE towards God;*” [now follow the abuses of it] “ *So, for curious*

* See a most remarkable concession of *Heylin’s*; (*Life of Laud*, p. 29.)

"and carnal persons, LACKING THE SPIRIT OF GOD" [i. e. the reprobate, who are described in scripture, (Jude 19.) under this very character of not having the spirit], "*to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination, is a most dangerous downfall; whereby the devil doth thrust them either [1.] into desperation, or [2.] into wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.*" The article, then, plainly speaks of two distinct sorts of persons; the Elect, and the Non-elect. With regard to the converted Elect, the consideration of their predestination in Christ fills them with *sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort*; it *greatly establishes and confirms their faith*; and doth *fervently kindle their love towards God*: which love is the never-failing source of all good works. But, with regard to the others, the article expressly declares God's predestination to be a *sentence*; and a dismal sentence it is, to such: the contemplation of which serves to thrust them into *desperation and unclean living*. Never was any ecclesiastical decision a more exact unison with scripture: Who can read this 17th article, and not be reminded of that passage in the apostle, 1 Pet. ii. 8, 9?

The article closes with two wise and useful cautions; "*furthermore, we must [1.] receive GOD's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth in holy scripture: and [2.] in our doings, THAT WILL of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.*" Two propositions these, which every Calvinist allows; and the latter of which, by the bye, is evidently formed on the Calvinistic distinction of the divine will into *secret and revealed*.

But you still wage war against the import of the word *Elect*. Hence, page 112, you serve up the *crambe repetita* again, and will have it that "*The Elect and chosen of God are, all good Christians.*" You have given us to understand before, that God the Son *redeemed*, and God the Holy Spirit *sanctifies*, none but good Christians; as if the *effect* went before the *cause*: and now (if your definition has any meaning at all), you would insinuate again, that God

the Father does not *elect* and *chuse* men, until they become good: and then, I suppose, if they *lose* this goodness (for, upon Arminian principles, it is a very *slippery* thing), they are presently cashiered and *un-chose*: but, if their free-will should once more yield itself so pliable, as to grow good again, they are *re-elected* anew: and, perhaps, after they have been, in the course of a few years, *elect*ed and *un-elect*ed, *redeemed* and *un-redeemed*, *sanctified* and *un-sanctified*, *born again* and *un-born*, some hundreds of times: these “*Elect and chosen of God, these good Christians,*” MAY (for it is all a *chance*) perish and go to hell at last. A very suitable representation, this, of *the God who changeth not*, and of the *everlasting covenant which is ordered in all things and sure!* “The *elect and chosen of God are, all good Christians:*” invert the proposition, and you will advance a certain truth: “All good Christians,” those that are renewed, and sanctified in the spirit of their minds by divine grace, “are the *elect and chosen of God;*” known and discovered to be his chosen, by the grace which he hath given them. I am sure, St. Paul represents, sanctification, not as a *cause* or *condition* of election, but as a *fruit, effect*, and one subordinate *end* of it: *According as he hath chosen us in him* [in Christ] *before the foundation of the world,* [not because we were, or he foresaw we would be, “good Christians,” but that] *We should be holy and without blame before him in love: having PRE-DESTINATED us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, ACCORDING TO THE GOOD PLEASURE OF HIS WILL,* Eph. i. 4, 5. I wish you would read what Bishop Fell observes on this passage: the testimony of that learned and worthy Bishop of Oxford might be a means of making you see the *absurdity*, as well as *impiety*, of turning the gospel plan upside-down, by bottoming God’s decrees on any qualification (whether actual or foreseen) in the *creature*. You go on, (*ibid.*) “*Christ’s sheep are they who hear his voice, and follow him, and abound in good works.*” We all grant that his Sheep, or his Elect, “hear his voice” sooner

or later, in effectual calling; that they are made to "follow him" in the regeneration, "and abound in "good works," from the genuine principles of faith and love. But then we assert, with the Scripture, and conformably to the doctrine of our church, that this sanctification of them is not the cause of their *being* his sheep and his chosen, but *proofs, marks, and evidences* of their having been so from everlasting. Our Lord himself, John x. styles the Elect *his sheep*, PREVIOUSLY to their hearing his voice: *My Sheep hear my voice, &c.* they do not hear it, in order to their *becoming* his Sheep, but hear it *as such*, and *because* they were such. So, verse 16, the Elect, even while *unregenerate*, and who had *not yet* heard his voice, are termed his *Sheep*; — *And other Sheep I have, which are not of this* [of the Jewish] *fold; them also I MUST bring, and they SHALL hear my voice*: according to what he says, elsewhere, *All that the Father giveth me, shall come unto me*. He tells the *reprobate* Jews, chap. x. *Ye believe not, because ye are not of my Sheep*, i. e. in the number of my *Elect*. But if the word *Sheep* does not signify *elect* persons, but *good Christians*; the sense of our Lord's declaration would be this, "ye are not believers and good Christians, because ye are not believers and good Christians!"

As you will not let the word *Elect* have fair play for itself; the word *Church* must, it seems, come in for a share of the same fate, p. 112. "*The church, in Scripture, signifies the whole body of Christians, of which Christ is the head.*" Do you mean the *visible*, or the *invisible* church? If the *visible*, it does most certainly consist of the whole body of professing Christians, of whom Christ is the acknowledged head. But, if you mean the *invisible church* (that church, which Christ loved, and for which he gave himself unto death, Eph. v. 25.) your definition is much too vague and lax: *This church being συνηλεστη, co-elect with Christ, and ordained to grace and glory through him; the church of the first-born, who are enrolled in Heaven, Heb. xii. and whose names are, from before the foundation of the world, in the Lamb's*

Book of Life, Luke x. 20. Phil. iv. 3. Rev. xvii. 8. The constituent members of this invisible church, when brought to the knowledge of Christ by effectual calling, and added to the visible fold, are, in Scripture, the true εκκλησια, or the company of men *called out of the world*, and gathered in *from among* mankind: so that, during their abode on earth, they are *a kingdom within a kingdom*, as being not only subjects of the *kingdom of Providence* (which they were before, in common with the rest), but likewise exalted to be subjects of the *kingdom of grace*, which all mankind are not.

I could wish, Sir, that you had observed some regular plan, in your handling of the points in debate. Instead of this, the *method*, you observe, is as rambling and embarrassed, as the *system*, you have embraced. Your performance had been less intricate and confused, if you had reduced it to some *order*, and delivered all you had to say on Predestination, Free-will, and final Perseverance, under each of those heads respectively, without running them one into another. For want of this, I am forced to follow you through your various windings, and measure back the ground already trod, by perpetually reverting to the same subjects.—After giving us your definition of the word *church*, you recur to the doctrine of *universal redemption*: which you aver to be taught by our HOMILIES. That the church, when treating of Christ's sacrifice and death, does not always, in so many words, expressly limit redemption to the Elect only; is no argument of her holding the absurd doctrines of *a random salvation*, and of *redemption* without a plan. It is her own stated rule, and a very just one, that "The promises of God are to be received in such wise, as they be generally set forth in holy scripture." This rule *she* has generally followed, and in it *we* follow her too; and assert, *pleno ore*, that "God so loved the world," i. e. Gentiles as well as Jews, "that he gave his only-begotten Son, to the end that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." The question, then, between

between the Arminians and us, is, not, Whether all true believers shall be saved; for we hold that as a certain truth: but, Whether saving faith (which always works by love) is of *man's acquisition*, or of *God's operation*.

Now, again, for *perseverance*, p. 118. “*The 16th article teaches, that, after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin: and that deadly sin is here meant, appears from the beginning of the article. It follows, that, by the grace of God, we may rise again: which plainly implies, that we also may not rise again.*” Pray, Sir, let the article speak for itself. The title of it runs thus, “*Of sin after BAPTISM:*” and the article itself is as follows; “Not every deadly sin, wilfully committed AFTER BAPTISM, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore, the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin AFTER BAPTISM. After we have received the HOLY GHOST” [i. e. after we have been *baptized*, as the words, immediately preceding, explain it] “we may depart from grace given,” &c. The conclusions, to be inferred from this article, are, 1. That it treats of sins committed, not after *spiritual* and *internal regeneration*, but simply, *after baptism*. 2. That, it is probable, some common, restraining influences of the spirit may usually be vouchsafed to the recipients of this ordinance: but still, these influences don't, for any thing the article says, amount to *real regeneration*: consequently, it has nothing to do with the doctrine of final perseverance, which relates to the *truly regenerate*, and to them *only*. 3. The *departure from grace given*, of which the article makes mention, is only simply styled a *departure*, without declaring that departure to be either *total* or *final*: consequently, it does not at all affect the present argument. 4. The whole apparently relates, not to matters of spiritual grace, but to *ecclesiastical censures* and the exercise of *church discipline*. If, for example, a member of the church be under excommunication for some atrocious crime committed, or for some public scandal given,

after baptism; the church, upon such a person's open repentance, is to accept of his submission, and recall her censures: as appears, not only from the main drift of the article, but, in particular, from those words of it, "*The grant of repentance is not to be denied to such, as fall into sin after baptism.*" Hence, this article, 5. Expressly condemns the severity of the old *Novatians*; who held, that such baptized persons, as had fallen away in persecuting times, were for ever to be excluded from the communion of the church. 6. It follows, from the article, that they are no less to be condemned, who would set up for *sinless perfection*; and that, 7. Baptized persons and professing Christians are liable to fall into sin, and may, by grace, recover and rise again. All which is very true, and doubted of by no Calvinist within the sphere of my acquaintance. —Bishop *Burnet* would gladly enough have caught at this article, in proof of the saints apostacy, had the article itself looked at all that way. But he saw it did not, and therefore explains it in a manner, very different from the glosses and perversions, with which Dr. Nowell would darken it. Surely, the *cause* must be very weak, which, in so able an hand as yours, is so feebly and so unfairly supported! Why should you labour, so ardently, to make the church contradict herself? In the 17th article, as I observed before, the Elect are expressly said, to be "*Justified, called, con-*" "*formed to the image of Christ, to walk religiously in*" "*good works, and, at length, to attain to everlasting*" "*felicity:*" but how could they be said to actually *attain to everlasting felicity*, if all or any of them might perish by the way?

Nor do our *Homilies* run counter to our articles. Your citations from the former, only prove these five things; 1. That the regenerate are not, in this life, *impeccable*. 2. That, without carefulness and circumspection, the most advanced in grace may not only sin, but even sin grievously. 3. That the spiritual life of the soul must be cherished, and kept up, by a diligent
and

and humble attendance on the several means of grace. 4. That good works and all holy obedience are the inseparable effects of true faith; and, 5. That all hope of interest in Christ, and expectation of salvation by him, are vain and groundless, unless we prove ourselves his children, by walking as he walked.

Lastly, We come to the doctrine of *Justification by Faith*. On this important subject, you deliver your judgment as follows; page 123, "*We all hold, that we are justified FREELY by God's grace: that there is NO merit in good works: that we are not to place our dependence, or rest our plea, on ANY works that we HAVE done or CAN do; but ONLY on the MERCY of God, and the MERITS of our Redeemer.*" And again, page 124, "*We hold, as well as you, that justification is the act of God alone, conferred on us freely, by his grace: that our own good works have no proper efficiency in the act of our justification; have no worth or merit in them: That we have all sinned and come short of the glory of God, and can be justified and saved ONLY BY FAITH,*" which faith you immediately define to be, "*A reliance on the mercies and merits of Christ.*" After giving us such a confession of your faith, who could have imagined that you would, almost in the same breath, blow down the whole fabric? by saying, page 123, "*On the other hand, I should hope, that All, who believe the Gospel, would agree, that good works are the necessary condition both of our justification and salvation.*" How! justified and saved only by faith, and yet, Good works the necessary condition both of our justification and salvation! Which soever of these two propositions is right, one of them must be wrong; because two contradictory assertions cannot be both true. If faith be, as you say it is, neither more nor less than *A reliance on the mercies and merits of Christ*, and we are justified and saved by faith only; it follows, that good works cannot possibly be the necessary condition of our justification and salvation.

To tell you plainly, Sir, the doctrine of the Scriptures,

tures, and of our church, is: That justification itself consists in *God's esteeming and counting us righteous*: That he thus esteems and counts us righteous, neither for our *faith*, nor for our *works*, nor for *both* of them together; but *solely* and *entirely* on account of *Christ's sacrifice and obedience* imputed to us freely and fully: That the sacrifice and obedience of Christ, as the alone matter of our justification, are to be received, embraced, and rested upon *by faith only*, which faith is the gift of God: and, That this faith, thus divinely given and wrought in the soul by the Holy Ghost, is lively, active and purifying; having its fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.—Sanctification, then, and good works, are not *conditions* of, but *consequences* resulting from, interest in Christ and acceptance with God: not *antecedent requisites*, à priori, in order to our *being* justified; but *subsequent evidences*, à posteriori, of our being so. Hence, our excellent church puts justification *before* good works, and makes good works *follow* justification. In her 11th article, she treats of *justification*; and THEN, in the 12th, considers *good works*.

ARTICLE XI. “ *Of the justification of man.*

“ *We are ACCOUNTED RIGHTEOUS before God, ONLY for the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ, BY FAITH, and NOT for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are JUSTIFIED BY FAITH ONLY, is a MOST WHOLE-SOME DOCTRINE, and very FULL OF COMFORT: as more largely is expressed in the homily of justification.*”

If *works*, if *all* works of our own, of every sort, and in every point of *view*, are not, here, totally excluded from having *any thing to do with* justification, à *parte ante*; there is no such thing as meaning in language. Yet our reformers, in the next article, speak, if possible, clearer still: and, as if they thought it not enough, simply to exclude *works* from having the least hand in any part of our justification; go on to acquaint us, that, until men *actually ARE justified*, they cannot so much as *do* a good work: *good works* being the EF-

FECT

PECT and FRUITS, of which *justification*, PREVIOUSLY received, is *itself* the SOURCE and CAUSE. And, if justification itself is the cause of good works, then good works cannot possibly be either the cause or condition of justification; because causes and conditions necessarily *precede* that, which they are the causes and conditions of.

ARTICLE XII. "Of good works.

" *Albeit, that good works, which are THE FRUITS of faith, and FOLLOW AFTER justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do SPRING OUT, necessarily, of a true and lively faith: insomuch that, by them, a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit.*"

Hence I conclude, that, if we are justified, or accounted righteous before God, ONLY for the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ received BY FAITH; and if good works themselves are the FRUITS of faith, and FOLLOW AFTER justification; then, good works cannot, in the very nature of things, go before justification, any more than fruit can exist, prior to the tree, that bears it; or an effect can be wrought, antecedently to the cause that produces it. Has the determination of our own church any weight with her members? If it has, they must and will acknowledge, that good works do not precede justification; and, consequently, cannot be (as Papists and Arminians pretend) a condition, without which God will not justify. The good works, which he has ordained for us to walk in, sucCEDE and FOLLOW UPON justification *ex post facto*; as marks and evidences of our being ALREADY in a justified state.—But our reformers foresaw, that some would probably ask, "Since justification is not, in any sense whatever, founded upon good works; but, on the contrary, all good works flow from justification; and these, flowing from it, can never be the source of THAT, from which themselves issue as the stream; What are we to think of those works, which are done prior to this justification
" by

“ by faith ?” To an enquiry of this sort, the *next* article returns *such* an answer, as effectually clinches the nail, and lays the axe to the very root of legal, conditional justification: declaring, that *no* works whatever, done by us before justification, are *pleasing to God*; and by consequence, that no man can, directly or indirectly, be justified by works of his own. It being, of all absurdities, the absurdest, to imagine, that those *sinful* works, with which God is actually *displeased*, should be conditions of obtaining his *favour*, or recommend us to his *acceptance*.

ARTICLE XIII. “ *Of works done before justification.*

“ *Works done BEFORE the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his spirit, are NOT PLEASANT to God; forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, &c.*”

With these decisions, our HOMILIES are perfect unisons. Witness the following citation, which being extremely important, most judiciously worded, and as pertinent to the subject, as if it had been *purposely* drawn up against Dr. Nowell; I request the reader to peruse it slowly, and to weigh it with the most careful attention. “ *These works*” [namely, such as are becoming of “ *new creatures in Christ*”] “ *the Apostle calleth good works; saying, we are God’s workmanship, created in Christ Jesus to good works, which God hath ordained that we should walk in them. And yet his meaning is not by these words to induce us to have any affiance, or to put any confidence in our works, as by the merit and deserving of them to purchase to ourselves and others remission of sin, and so consequently everlasting life: for that were mere blasphemy against God’s mercy, and great derogation to the blood-shedding of our Saviour Jesus Christ. For it is of the free grace and mercy of God, by the mediation of the blood of his Son Jesus Christ, without merit or deserving on our part, that we are reconciled and brought again into his favour, and are made heirs of his heavenly kingdom. Grace, saith St. Augustine, be- longing to God, who doth call us: and THEN hath he good works, whosoever received grace. GOOD WORKS* “ *then*

" then, BRING NOT FORTH GRACE, *but* ARE BROUGHT
 " FORTH BY GRACE. *The wheel (saith he) turneth*
 " round, *not to the end that it may be made round; but,*
 " BECAUSE IT IS FIRST MADE round, THEREFORE it
 " TURNETH round. So no man doeth good works to receive
 " grace by his good works, but BECAUSE HE HATH
 " FIRST RECEIVED GRACE, THEREFORE, CONSE-
 " QUENTLY he doeth good works. And in another place,
 " he [St. Austin] saith: GOOD WORKS GO NOT BEFORE,
 " in him which shall afterwards be justified; but good works
 " do FOLLOW AFTER, when a man IS, first, justified*.
 " St. Paul therefore teacheth, that we must do good works,
 " for divers respects, 1. To shew ourselves obedient chil-
 " dren to our heavenly Father, &c. 2. For that they
 " are good DECLARATIONS and TESTIMONIALS of our
 " justification. 3. That others, seeing our good works, may
 " be rather by them be stirred up and excited, &c."
 Homily of fasting. Part 1.

Good works, therefore, being the EFFECTS of justi-
 fication, cannot be the *cause* of it: any more than the
 volubility of a wheel is the cause of its rotundity. A
 wheel rolls, not in order to be MADE round, but in con-
 sequence of being already so; in like manner, men do
 good works, not in order to be justified; but in conse-
 quence of being justified already.—On this grand, fun-
 damental Church-of-England principle, the doctrine of
 conditional justification is the grossest of contradictions.
 For (suffer me to repeat the important remark) if no
 good works whatever can be done, *before* justification;
 it is absolutely impossible that justification should be at all
 suspended on good works: for then, justification would
 be suspended on a *non-entity*. How, Sir, can those
 good works be the condition of my justification, not
 one of which can have any existence until I AM

* Hence it appears, that St. Austin's famous adage, *Bona opera non præcedunt justificandum, sed sequuntur justificatum*; is, by its insertion into the above homily, become an article of our faith, which every son of the church professes to hold, and to which every minister of it has subscribed with his own hand.

justified!

justified ! Your assertion therefore, page 124. That
 “ *Good works, though imperfect and worthless, are*
 “ *yet required by God as necessary terms, qualifications, and*
 “ *conditions, both of our justification and salvation,*” is
 flatly giving the lie, not only to *Scripture*, but to every
article and homily of our church upon the subject. Let
 me likewise observe, by the way, that as, on the one hand,
 you extol good works too high, in representing them as
 conditions of justification; so, on the other, you sink
 them as much too low, in presuming to call them *worth-*
less. Works, resulting from grace, and wrought with a
 view to glorify God, deserve a better epithet, than that of
worthless. Had a CALVINIST stiled them so, you would
 have set him down at once for an *Antinomian*: and not
 without reason. *Good works*, though imperfect, are yet
 very far from being *worthless* things. Seeing, as the
 above homily justly observes, *they are proofs of our*
obedience to God, testimonies of our justification, and con-
 duce to the *edification of our fellow Christians*. We
 Calvinists value sanctification and good works, as THE
 WRITINGS of our heavenly *estate*: which, though, they
 have no hand in *procuring* the estate itself (for that is
 already done, by the precious merits of the sole Media-
 tor between God and man), yet *prove* that the estate *is*
 our’s through the free grace of God and the alone
 righteousness of Christ.—Good works, therefore, though
 no part of our dependence, nor any condition of our
 present or everlasting acceptance; are still by no means
worthless, as you have contemptuously, and inconsis-
 tently with your own plan, ventured to style them.
 However *worthless* you may affect to deem them, woe be
 to you and me, if we are eventually found *without* them.

I have now, so far as the CHURCH OF ENGLAND is pro-
 perly concerned, touched on the most material parts of
 your pamphlet: and am of opinion, for my own part,
 that your design is not very happily executed, nor
 your objections very solidly founded. I really think,
 upon a review of the whole, that you have no great
 reason to sing *Te Deum*, for your imaginary triumph
 over

over the doctrines of the reformation. Yet is it matter of lamentation, that you should even have *attempted* to subvert them; and that the church should receive any blow, how *slight* soever, from so respectable an hand. You have been fighting against *those very truths*, which, when you received ORDINATION, you, on your knees, was solemnly commissioned to defend; and which, previous to that solemnity, you had ratified as your own belief, by the deliberate SUBSCRIPTION of your name. Form to yourself, the idea of an *English officer*, who, false to the cause and service of HIS BRITANNIC MAJESTY, should, ungratefully and perfidiously, endeavour to promote the interest of *the French King*, at the very time that he wears the *regimentals*, and receives the *pay*, of his own lawful sovereign. Very pertinent to the present argument, is that expostulation of the great Dr. South: "To be impugned *from without*, and "betrayed *from within*, is, certainly, the worst condition, that either church or state can fall into: and "the BEST OF CHURCHES, the CHURCH OF ENGLAND, has "had experience of *both*. It had been to be wished, "and, one would think, might very reasonably have "been *expected*, that, when providence had took the "work, of destroying the church of England, out of "the *Papists* hands; some would have been contented "with her *preferments*, without either attempting to give "up her *rites* and *liturgy*, or deserting her DOCTRINE: "but it has proved much otherwise.*" It has, indeed. How much farther God will suffer us to fall, is best known to him that knows all things. I only wish, that "we may not part with one thing after another, till "we have nothing left. How wide a difference there is, between the doctrine of THE CHURCH, and that of SOME CHURCHMEN (as Dr. South well distinguishes), will appear yet plainer, by the following extracts from a *book*, which, I fear, is subscribed by too many who have never read it: I mean, THE HOMILYS of our

* Preface to his Animadversions on SHERLOCK. 1693.

established church. Let THESE decide, whether *Calvinists* or *Arminians* best deserve the name of *churchmen*.

I. Concerning PREDESTINATION, as it respects *Christ the Mediator*, our church delivers herself thus: "When
" the fullness of time was come, that is, the perfection
" and course of years *appointed from the beginning*; then
" God, according to his former covenant and promise,
" sent a *Messias*." Hom. *on the nativity*, p. 243.*

Again, "Remember that ye be bought from your vain
" conversation, and that your freedom is purchased
" neither with gold nor silver, but with the price of
" the precious blood of that innocent Lamb, Jesus
" Christ, which was ORDAINED *to the same purpose before*
" *the world was made*." Hom. *on the resurrection*, p. 266.

Of predestination, as it respects mankind, I find as follows:

" When God had CHOSEN to himself a PECULIAR and
" SPECIAL people, FROM AMONGST all other nations
" that knew not God,—he gave unto them certain or-
" dinances, &c." Hom. *against idolatry*, p. 104. This
refers to the *antient Jews*. Let us now hear what is
said, concerning the *Christian Church*: "The true
" CHURCH is an universal congregation or fellowship
" of God's FAITHFUL and ELECT PEOPLE; built upon
" the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus
" Christ himself being the head corner stone." Hom. *for*
Whitsunday, p. 283.

" Let us only trust to be saved by his death and pas-
" sion, and to have our sins clean washed away through
" his most precious blood; that in the end of the world,
" when he shall come again to judge both the quick
" and the dead, he may receive us into his heavenly
" kingdom, and place us in the number of his ELECT
" AND CHOSEN PEOPLE." Hom. 2. *on the passion*, p. 261.

Once more: "God, of his mercy and SPECIAL FA-
" VOUR towards them, WHOM HE HATH APPOINTED TO
" EVERLASTING SALVATION, hath *so* offered his grace

* My edition of the Homilys, is that printed in 1673.

“ ESPECIALLY, and they have so received it fruitfully ;
 “ that although, by reason of their sinful living out-
 “ wardly, they SEEMED, before, to have been the
 “ children of wrath and perdition ; yet now, *the spirit*
 “ *of God* MIGHTILY WORKING IN THEM, they declare,
 “ by their outward deeds and life, in the shewing of
 “ mercy and charity (which CANNOT come, BUT of the
 “ Spirit of God, and his ESPECIAL GRACE) that they are
 “ the *undoubted children of God*, APPOINTED TO EVER-
 “ LASTING LIFE. And so, as, by their wickedness and
 “ ungodly living, they shewed themselves according to
 “ *the judgment of men*, which follow the outward ap-
 “ pearance, to be *reprobates* and *castaways* ; so now,
 “ by their obedience unto God’s holy will, and by their
 “ merciful and tender pity (wherein they SHEW them-
 “ selves to be like unto God, who is the fountain and
 “ spring of all mercy), they declare openly and mani-
 “ festly to the sight of men, that they are the SONS OF
 “ GOD, and ELECT OF HIM UNTO SALVATION.” Hom.
 2. on alms-deeds, p. 235, 203. Hence, it is clearly the
 doctrine of our church, 1. That there are some persons
elect, chosen, and appointed of God to everlasting life. 2.
 That this his choice of them, and their subsequent re-
 generation, are founded on his own *mercy* and *special*
favour towards them. 3. That the elect, even BEFORE
 they are converted and sanctified, are not, in reality, ob-
 jects of God’s hatred, but only SEEM to be such, *in the*
judgment of men. 4. That the CONVERSION of the elect
 is wrought by God’s *especial grace*, and by his spirit
mightily working in them. 5. That sanctification and
 good works are (not the *causes* and *conditions* of election,
 but) the marks, proofs, evidences and consequences of
 it ; whereby the regenerate DECLARE *openly and mani-*
festly, that they are the undoubted children of God, AP-
 POINTED TO EVERLASTING LIFE, and ELECT OF HIM
 UNTO SALVATION.

Nor is our church silent, as to that other branch of
 God’s decree, commonly called *reprobation*. “ Christ
 “ himself, the prophets before him, the apostles after
 H “ him,

“ him, all the true ministers of God’s holy word, yea,
 “ every word in God’s book, is, unto THE REPROBATE,
 “ the favor of death unto death.” Hom. 2. *on certain
 places of scripture*, p. 228. And, elsewhere, more round-
 ly still: God “ will have none in council with him, nor
 “ any to ask the reason of his doing: for *he may do what
 “ liketh him*, and *none can resist him*. For *he worketh
 “ all things*, in his SECRET JUDGMENT, *to his own plea-
 “ sure*; yea EVEN THE WICKED TO DAMNATION, saith
 “ Solomon.” *Rogation*, 1 Hom. p. 289.

Intimately connected with (and, indeed, *solely founded
 upon*) *predestination*, is the doctrine of *absolute providence*:
 concerning which latter, the church thus speaks; “ Epi-
 “ cures they be, that imagine, that he” (God) “ walk-
 “ eth about the coasts of the heavens, and hath no re-
 “ spect of these inferior things, but that all these
 “ things should proceed either by *chance*, or at *adven-
 “ ture*, or else by disposition of *fortune*; and God to
 “ have no stroke in them. What other thing is this to
 “ say, than, as the fool supposeth in his heart, there is
 “ no God?” *Rogation*, 2 Hom. p. 293.

II. With regard to the EXTENT OF REDEMPTION, our
 church expressly declares, that Christ “ Is the high
 “ and everlasting priest, who hath offered himself once
 “ for all upon the altar of the cross, and, with that one
 “ oblation, hath made perfect for evermore THEM THAT
 “ ARE SANCTIFIED.” Hom. 1. *Of salvation*, p. 10.
 More minutely still: “ The end of his coming, was,
 “ to save and deliver HIS PEOPLE.” Hom. *on the nativity*,
 p. 247. Again: “ Christ put himself between God’s
 “ deserved wrath and our sin; and rent that obligation,
 “ wherein we were in danger to God, and PAID OUR
 “ DEBT. Our debt was a great deal too great for us to
 “ have paid; and without payment, God the Father
 “ could never be at one with us. Neither was it pos-
 “ sible to be loosed from this debt, by our own ability.
 “ It pleased *him* therefore, to be the payer thereof,
 “ and to DISCHARGE US QUITE.” Hom. 1. *On the
 passion*,

passion, p. 249, 250. Hence it appears, that, in the opinion of our church, Christ did not lay down his life, to put men into a *salvable* state, and render their salvation *barely possible*: but, actually and absolutely, secured the discharge of those he redeemed: and, indeed, it would have been *no redemption*, without this. Christ is here said to have positively PAID OUR DEBT, and to have *so* payed it, as to DISCHARGE US QUITE. Seems it not, therefore, to flow from these premises, That the spiritual debts of *those* who shall be condemned in the last day, were *not paid* by him? for, if they were, how can it come to pass, that some of those very persons shall *be thrown into prison*, and there *tormented*, whose debts have been really paid to the uttermost farthing? Will not the judge of the whole earth do right? Is it consistent with our ideas of justice, that God the Father should demand *double* payment of the self-same debts, by charging sin *first* to the *surety's* account, and *then* to *the sinner's* afterward? Christ, says our homily, DISCHARGED US QUITE: but can such persons be said to be *quite discharged*, on whom divine justice hath still an unsatisfied claim, and against whom the debt-book is yet uncrossed, and for whom penal vengeance is laid up in store? Upon these two correlative suppositions, 1. That the death of Christ was a *vicarious* punishment; and, 2. that it was a *proper, real, adequate atonement* for sin (both which are the avowed doctrines of our church); either *universal salvation*, or a *limited redemption*, must necessarily follow. But the church does not hold universal salvation; therefore, you must either grant, that she contradicts her own fundamental principles, or, that she believes redemption to be only co-extensive with election.—There is, I apprehend, but one way, to elude the force of this argument; and that is, fairly and above-board, to take refuge in* *Socinianism* (as the great Gro-

* The alliance between *Socinianism* and *Arianism*, is evident from the confession of an Arminian divine; *Tindal*; *Cont. of Rapin*, vol. 15. p. 237, note a. Also *Biogr. Dict.* vol. 10. p. 404.

tius at length unhappily did) by denying that Christ died as our substitute, and *in our room and stead*. But this refuge is attended with ten thousand times worse consequences, than either the doctrine of unlimited salvation, or that of partial redemption. — The Arminian salvo, that “ Christ died for us, only to put us into a “ *capacity* of being saved if we are willing to close in “ with certain terms offered ;” leaves the matter every jot as embarrassed as it found it. Since, it can never, with any colour of reason, be supposed, that he would ascertain the *end*, without securing the *means*: for that would be doing just nothing at all. He cannot be said to have purchased *salvation* for any, for whom he did not likewise obtain those influences of *saving grace*, without which, final salvation cannot be had: nor am I able to conceive, how a Being, of *infinite wisdom*, would actually pay down a price of *infinite value*, and yet leave it quite uncertain, whether the *purchased blessings* should be enjoyed by those for whom he bought them. This will still appear more unlikely (or rather impossible), if we take his *FORE-KNOWLEDGE* into the account. Would he (with the deepest reverence be it asked) shed his inestimably precious blood for those persons, who, as himself knew at that very time he did it, would certainly reject the redemption wrought? If he did *not* foreknow this, what becomes of his *deity*? If he *did* foreknow it, and yet died for such; it was, in effect, redeeming them unto greater condemnation: and then, redemption (so far as these persons are concerned) can hardly be considered as an act of *mercy*. — For my own part, these and similar considerations strike me so strongly, that I find myself obliged, by dint both of rational and scripture evidence, to believe, that Christ actually and infallibly secured the salvation of every individual for whom he died: that repentance, faith, and holiness are wrought in those he hath ransomed; and that God giveth *GRACE* and *GLORY* to all them, for whom he gave his *SON*. — This train of reasoning is not a little countenanced, by the following passage in another of our *homilies*.
 “ Now

“ Now it followeth to have, with this knowledge, a
 “ sure and constant faith, not only that the death of
 “ Christ is *available* * for the redemption of all the
 “ world, for the remission of sins, and reconciliation
 “ with God the Father: but also that he hath made,
 “ upon the cross, a full and sufficient sacrifice for *THEE*,
 “ a perfect cleansing of *THY* sins: So that thou—mayest
 “ say, with the apostle, that he loved *THEE*, and gave
 “ himself for *THEE*.” Hom. *On the sacrament*, p. 272.
 But, if Christ loved *all* men, and gave himself for every
individual of mankind; he must of course have loved
me, and given himself for *me*: consequently, this assured
 faith, of his being *my* lover, *my* sacrifice, and *my* Sa-
 viour in particular, could not, upon the principle of
 universal redemption, be so high and distinguishing a
 privilege, as the homily here represents it. — Upon the
 whole, when the homilies appear to speak of redemp-
 tion as *general*, it seems but fair to understand them,
 rather in an *indefinite*, than in a *strictly unlimited* sense.
 Such a declaration, as this that follows, should be looked
 upon as explanatory of the church’s meaning in other
 places, where the restriction is not so expressly laid
 down: Christ “ was obedient even to the very death,
 “ the death of the cross. And this he did, for *us ALL*
 “ that BELIEVE.” First homily *on the passion*, p. 250.

III. Man’s EXCEEDING DEPRAVATION by nature, and
 TOTAL INABILITY as to spiritual good, are largely and
 strongly asserted in our homilies. “ The Holy Ghost, in
 “ writing the holy scriptures, is in nothing more diligent,
 “ than to pull down man’s vain glory and pride; which
 “ of all vices, is most universally grafted in all man-
 “ kind, even from the first infection of our first father
 “ *Adam*.” First homily *on the misery of man*, p. 6.

“ St. Paul, in many places, painteth us out in our
 “ colours, calling us the children of the wrath of God

* That is, of *sufficient value*: which it most certainly is. But *avail-
 ableness*, or *intrinsic sufficiency*, is one thing; intentional and actual
 efficacy is another. The argument, *à Potentia ad Actum*, concludes
 nothing.

“ when we be born: saying also, that WE CANNOT THINK
 “ A GOOD THOUGHT, of ourselves; much less can we
 “ SAY well, or DO well, ourselves.” *Ibid.* p. 8.

“ We be, of ourselves, of such earth as can bring
 “ forth but weeds, nettles, brambles, briars, cockles,
 “ and darnel. Our fruits be declared in the 5th chap-
 “ ter to the *Galatians*. We have neither faith, charity,
 “ hope, patience, chastity, NOR ANY THING ELSE THAT
 “ GOOD IS, but of God: and therefore these virtues be
 “ called there, THE FRUITS of the HOLY GHOST, and
 “ NOT THE FRUITS OF MAN.” Second homily *on ditto*.
 p. 9.

“ Of ourselves, and by ourselves, we have NO GOOD-
 “ NESS, help, nor salvation: but, contrarywise, sin,
 “ damnation, and death everlasting. Which if we
 “ deeply weigh and consider, we shall the better un-
 “ derstand the great mercy of God, and how our salva-
 “ tion cometh only by Christ: for, in ourselves (as of
 “ ourselves), we find NOTHING whereby we may be de-
 “ livered from this miserable captivity, into the which
 “ we were cast, through the envy of the Devil, BY
 “ BREAKING OF GOD’S COMMANDMENT IN OUR FIRST
 “ PARENT *Adam*. We are all become unclean, but we
 “ all are not able to cleanse ourselves, nor to make
 “ one another of us clean. We are by nature the
 “ children of God’s wrath, but we are not able to make
 “ ourselves the children and inheritors of God’s glory.
 “ We are sheep that run astray, but we cannot of our
 “ own power come again to the sheep-fold; so great is
 “ our imperfection and weakness. *Ibid.* p. 10.

“ St. *Ambrose* concludeth in a few words, saying, He
 “ that by nature would withstand vice, either by NA-
 “ TURAL WILL, or *reason*, he doth in vain garnish
 “ the time of this life, and attaineth not the very true
 “ virtues.” First homily *on good works*, p. 28.

“ These sentences (good people), unto A NATURAL
 “ MAN, seem mere absurdities, contrary to all reason.
 “ For, a natural man, as St. Paul saith, UNDERSTAND-
 “ ETH NOT THE THINGS THAT BELONG TO GOD: nei-
 “ ther

“ ther can he, so long as old Adam dwelleth in him.”
Second homily *on certain places of scripture*, p. 225.

“ God therefore, for his mercy’s sake, vouchsafe to
“ purify our minds, through faith in his son Jesus
“ Christ, and to instill the heavenly drops of his grace
“ into OUR HARD STONY HEARTS to supple the same.”
Ibid. p. 229.

“ Let us, throughout our whole lives, confess all
“ good things to come of God, of what name or na-
“ ture soever they be: not of these corruptible things
“ only,—but much more of all spiritual graces behov-
“ able for our soul.” Second *rogation* homily, p. 296.

“ If any gift we have, wherewith we may work to
“ the glory of God, and profit of our neighbour;
“ ALL IS WROUGHT BY HIS OWN AND SELF-SAME SPIRIT,
“ which maketh his distributions peculiarly to every
“ man AS HE WILL.” Third *rogation* homily, p. 299.

“ We have, of our own selves, NOTHING to present
“ us to God.” First homily *on repentance*, p. 326.

Such are the ideas inculcated by the church of Eng-
land, concerning *man’s free-will*, and the *powers of na-
ture*.

IV. Equally careful she is, to assert the ABSOLUTE
ENERGY, INDEPENDENCE, AND EFFICIENCY OF DIVINE
G R A C E. “ As the good fruit is not the cause that
“ the tree is good, but the tree must first be good, be-
“ fore it can bring forth good fruit; so the good deeds
“ of men are not the cause, that maketh man good, but
“ he is FIRST made good by the SPIRIT AND GRACE OF
“ GOD, that EFFECTUALLY WORKETH in him, and AF-
“ TERWARD he bringeth forth good fruits.” And, a
little lower, we meet with this expression, “ The
“ GRACE of GOD, which WORKETH ALL IN ALL.” Se-
cond homily *on alms-deeds*, p. 236.

“ Where the HOLY GHOST worketh, there NOTHING
“ IS UNPOSSIBLE: as may further also appear by the
“ INWARD REGENERATION and SANCTIFICATION of
“ mankind.” From whence, taking occasion to speak
of *Nicodemus*, the homily adds; “ Behold a lively pat-

“ tern of a fleshly and carnal man. He had little or
 “ no intelligence of the Holy Ghost, and therefore he
 “ goeth bluntly to work, and asketh how this thing”
 [namely, *inward regeneration by the Spirit of God*] “ were
 “ possible to be true? Whereas otherwise, if he had
 “ known the GREAT POWER of the Holy Ghost in this
 “ behalf, that it is HE which INWARDLY WORKETH
 “ the REGENERATION and NEW BIRTH of mankind; he
 “ would never have marvelled at Christ’s words, but
 “ would rather take occasion thereby to praise and
 “ glorify God.” First homily for *Whitsunday*, p. 279.

“ Man, of his own nature, is fleshly and carnal, cor-
 “ rupt and naught, sinful and disobedient to God, WITH-
 “ OUT ANY SPARK OF GOODNESS IN HIM, without ANY
 “ virtuous or godly motion, ONLY given to evil
 “ thoughts and wicked deeds. As for the works of
 “ the Spirit, the fruits of faith, charitable and godly
 “ motions; if he have ANY AT ALL in him, they pro-
 “ ceed ONLY of the Holy Ghost, who is THE ONLY
 “ WORKER OF OUR SANCTIFICATION, and maketh us NEW
 “ MEN in Christ Jesus. Such is the power of the Holy
 “ Ghost to REGENERATE men, and, as it were, to BRING
 “ THEM FORTH ANEW, so that they shall be nothing
 “ like the men that they were before.” *Ibid.* p. 280.

“ Let them all come together, that be now glorified
 “ in heaven, and let us hear what answer they will make
 “ in these points before rehearsed, whether their *first*
 “ *creation* was in God’s goodness, or of themselves.
 “ Forsooth, *David* would make answer for them all,
 “ and say, Know ye for surety, even the Lord is God;
 “ He hath made us, and not we ourselves. If they
 “ were asked again, *who shall be thanked for their*
 “ REGENERATION? for their JUSTIFI-
 “ CATION? and for their SALVATION?
 “ whether their deserts, or GOD’S GOODNESS ONLY? Let
 “ *David* answer by the mouth of them all at this time,
 “ who cannot chuse but say, Not to us, O Lord, not to
 “ us, but to thy name give all the thanks, for thy lov-
 “ ing mercy and for thy truth’s sake. If we should
 ask

“ ask again, FROM WHENCE came their glorious works
 “ and deeds, which they wrought in their lives, where-
 “ with God was so highly pleased and worshipped by
 “ them? Let some other witness be brought in, to
 “ testify this matter; that in the mouth of two or
 “ three, may the truth be known. Verily, that holy
 “ prophet *Esay* beareth record, and saith, O Lord, IT
 “ IS THOU, of thy goodness, that hast WROUGHT ALL
 “ OUR WORKS IN US, not we ourselves. And, to up-
 “ hold the truth of this matter, against all *justiciaries*
 “ and hypocrites, which ROB ALMIGHTY GOD OF HIS
 “ HONOUR, and ASCRIBE IT TO THEMSELVES, St. *Paul*,
 “ bringeth in his belief: We be not (saith he) suffi-
 “ cient of ourselves, once to think any thing: but
 “ all our ableness is of God’s goodness. For He it is,
 “ in whom we have all our being, and living, and
 “ moving. If ye will know, furthermore, where they had
 “ their gifts and sacrifices, which they offered continual-
 “ ly in their lives to Almighty God; they cannot but
 “ agree with *David*, where he saith, Of thy liberal hand,
 “ O Lord, we have received that we gave unto Thee.
 “ If this holy company, therefore, confests so constantly,
 “ that ALL THE GOODS AND GRACES, wherewith they
 “ were endued in soul, CAME OF THE GOODNESS OF GOD
 “ ONLY; what more can be said, to prove, that *all that*
 “ *is good* cometh from Almighty God? — To justify a
 “ sinner, to NEW CREATE him from a wicked person to
 “ a righteous man, IS A GREATER ACT, (saith St. *Augus-*
 “ *tine*), THAN TO MAKE SUCH A NEW HEAVEN AND EARTH
 “ as is already made.” *First rogation* homily, p. 289, 290.
 “ ALL spiritual gifts and graces come especially from
 “ God. Let us consider the truth of this matter, and
 “ hear what is testified, first, of THE GIFT OF FAITH,
 “ the first entry into the Christian life, without the
 “ which, no man can please God. For St. *Paul* con-
 “ fesses it plainly to be God’s GIFT; saying, Faith is
 “ the gift of God. It is verily GOD’S WORK IN US, the
 “ charity wherewith we love our brethren. — If any
 “ WILL we have to rise, it is HE that PREVENTETH
 “ OUR

“ OUR WILL, and disposeth us thereto. Who worketh
 “ these GREAT MIRACLES in us? *our* worthiness, *our*
 “ deservings and ENDEAVOURS, *our* wits and virtue?
 “ Nay verily, St. *Paul* will not suffer flesh and clay to
 “ presume to such arrogancy; and, therefore, saith,
 “ ALL is of God, who hath reconciled us unto Him-
 “ self by Jesus Christ.” Third *rogation* homily, p. 297.
 We must “ Beware and take heed, that we do in no
 “ wise think in our hearts, imagine, or believe, that
 “ we are able to repent aright, or to turn effectually
 “ unto the Lord, by our own might and strength. For
 “ this must be verified in all men, *Without ME ye can*
 “ *do nothing*. Again, of ourselves we are not able as
 “ much as *to think a good thought*. And, in another
 “ place, IT IS GOD THAT WOKETH IN US BOTH THE
 “ WILL AND THE DEED. For this cause, though
 “ *Hieremie* had said before, *Turn unto me, saith the*
 “ *Lord*; yet afterwards he saith, TURN THOU ME,
 “ AND I SHALL BE TURNED, *for thou art the*
 “ *Lord my God*. And therefore that antient writer, and
 “ holy father, *Ambrose*, doth plainly affirm, that THE
 “ TURNING OF THE HEART UNTO GOD, IS OF GOD; as
 “ the Lord himself doth testify by His prophet, saying,
 “ *And I WILL GIVE THEE AN HEART to know Me, that*
 “ *I am the Lord*: and they SHALL be my people,
 “ and I WILL be their God, for they SHALL RE-
 “ TURN unto me with their whole heart.” First ho-
 mily *on repentance*, p. 330, 331. So far is the church
 of England, from making the *grace* of God *strike* to the
free-will of his creatures!

Next, for the doctrine of JUSTIFICATION.

V. “ Let us know our own works, of what imper-
 “ fection they be, and then we shall not stand foolishly
 “ and arrogantly in our own conceits, nor challenge
 “ ANY PART of justification by our merits, or works.”
 Second homily *on man's misery*, p. 9.

“ All the good works that we can do, be imperfect;
 “ and therefore not able to deserve our justification:
 “ but

“ but our justification doth come FREELY, by the MERE
“ MERCY of God.” First homily of *salvation*,* p. 13.

“ By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not
“ of yourselves; for it is the GIFT of God, and not of
“ works, lest any man should glory. And, to be
“ short, the sum of all *Paul*’s disputation is this: That
“ if justice” [*i. e.* justification] “ come of works, then
“ it cometh NOT OF GRACE; and, if it come of grace,
“ then it cometh NOT OF WORKS. And to this end
“ tend all the prophets, as *St. Peter* saith in the xth
“ of the *Acts*. Of *Christ* all the prophets (saith *St.*
“ *Peter*) do witness, that, through His name, all they,
“ that do BELIEVE in Him, shall receive the remission
“ of sins.—*St. Hilary* speaketh these words plainly,
“ in the ixth canon upon *Matthew*, ‘Faith only justify-
“ eth.’ And *St. Basil*, a Greek author, writeth thus:
“ This is a perfect and whole rejoicing in God, when a
“ man advanceth not himself for HIS OWN RIGHTEOUS-
“ NESS, but acknowledgeth himself to lack true justice
“ and righteousness, and to be justified by the ONLY
“ FAITH in *Christ*. And *Paul* (saith he) doth glory in
“ the CONTEMPT OF HIS OWN RIGHTEOUSNESS, and
“ that he looketh for THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD by
“ faith. These be the very words of *St. Basil*. And
“ *St. Ambrose*, a Latin Author, saith these words: THIS
“ is the ordinance of God, that they, which believe in
“ *Christ*, should be saved WITHOUT WORKS, BY FAITH
“ ONLY, FREELY receiving remission of their sins.
“ Consider diligently” [adds the homily] “ these words,

* *Mr. Strype* has an observation, which deserves to be noticed here. “ In the first framing of this homily,” says he, viz. the homily of *Salvation*, “ there was a great controversy between Archbishop CRANMER, the chief composer thereof, and Bishop GARDINER, concerning that branch of it, that asserted JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH: as may be seen in the memorials of that great Archbishop, under the year 1547.” (*Annals of the Reformation under Queen Elizabeth*, p. 296.) And well there might: since nothing plunges the dagger deeper into the very heart of Popery, than that great, fundamental doctrine of the gospel, *free, unconditional Justification by Faith in the imputed righteousness of Christ*. This admirable homily is, itself, a standing demonstration, that, not *Gardiner*, but *Cranmer* prevailed.

“ without

“ *without works,—by faith only,—freely,—we receive*
 “ remission of our sins. What can be spoken more
 “ plainly, than to say, FREELY, WITHOUT WORKS, BY
 “ FAITH ONLY, we obtain remission of our sins?” Second
 part of the homily of *salvation*, p. 14, 15.

“ Man cannot make himself righteous by his own
 “ works, neither IN PART, nor in the whole. For that
 “ were THE GREATEST ARROGANCY AND PRESUMP-
 “ TION OF MAN, THAT ANTICHRIST COULD SET
 “ UP AGAINST GOD, to affirm that a man might, by his
 “ own works, take away and purge his own sins, and so
 “ justify himself. But justification is the office of God
 “ only, and is not a thing which we *render unto Him*,
 “ but which we RECEIVE of *Him*: not which we give
 “ to Him, but which we take of Him, by his FREE
 “ MERCY, and by the ONLY MERITS of his most dearly
 “ beloved Son, our only Redeemer, Saviour, and
 “ Justifier.” *Ibid.* p. 15, 16.

“ It is of the FREE GRACE AND MERCY of God, by
 “ the mediation of the BLOOD OF HIS SON JESUS
 “ CHRIST, WITHOUT MERIT OR DESERVING ON OUR
 “ PART, that our sins are forgiven us, that we are re-
 “ conciled and brought again into his favour, and are
 “ made heirs of his heavenly kingdom.” First homily
 on *fasting*, p. 165.

“ To fast, with this persuasion of mind, that our
 “ fasting and our GOOD WORKS, can make us perfect
 “ and just men, and, finally, BRING US TO HEAVEN;
 “ *this is a DEVILISH persuasion.*” *Ibid.* p. 168.

“ It” [namely, the *parable of the Pharisee and Pub-
 lican*] “ is spoken to them that trusted in themselves, that
 “ they were righteous, and despised others. Now, be-
 “ cause the *Pharisee* directeth his works to an *evil end*,
 “ SEEKING BY THEM JUSTIFICATION, which indeed is
 “ the proper work of God, WITHOUT OUR MERITS; his
 “ fasting twice in the week, and all his other works,
 “ though they were never so many, and seemed to the
 “ world never so good and holy, yet, in very deed, be-
 “ fore

“ fore God, they are altogether evil and abominable.”
Ibid. p. 169.

He must have piercing eyes indeed, who can discover any thing in our homilies, from whence to infer the *conditionality* of justification. What *Arminians* call *CONDITIONS*, our *Church* calls *GIFTS* of God: and those graces, which are the *gifts* of his own free favour, can never be the *conditions* of obtaining it. “Two things,” says the Church, “are chiefly to be respected, in every
 “ good and godly man’s prayer; his own *necessity*, and
 “ the *glory* of Almighty God. Necessity belongeth
 “ either outwardly to the body, or inwardly to the soul;
 “ which part of man” [*i. e.* the *soul*], “because it is
 “ much more precious and excellent than the other,
 “ therefore we ought, first of all, to CRAVE such things
 “ as properly belong to the salvation thereof: as, the
 “ GIFT of *repentance*; the GIFT of *faith*; the GIFT of
 “ *charity* and *good works*; remission and forgiveness of
 “ sins, &c. and such other like FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT.”
 Third homily on prayer, p. 198.

Some *Arminians*, of more subtilty and refinement than the rest of their sect, acknowledge, indeed, that we are not justified by *moral works and performances* of our own but by the *Tò credere*, or the *act* of believing: which FAITH ITSELF, say they, is IMPUTED to the believer, IN LIEU of that *perfect righteousness* which the law demands. This opinion is as totally unscriptural, and anti-scriptural, as the doctrine of justification by works. It is equally absurd in itself, and derogatory to the merits of Christ. I shall, however, in this place, content myself with proving, that this imaginary *imputation of faith for righteousness*, is NOT the doctrine of the church of England. “The true understanding of this doctrine,
 “ we be justified freely by faith without works, or that
 “ we be justified by faith in Christ only; is NOT, that this
 “ our own *act*, to BELIEVE in Christ, or this OUR FAITH
 “ in Christ, which is within us, DOTH JUSTIFY US
 “ and deserve our justification unto us, (for that were
 “ to count ourselves to be justified by some *act* or virtue
 “ that

“ *that is within ourselves*).—So that, as St. *John* the
 “ Baptist, although he were never so virtuous and godly
 “ a man, yet, in this matter of forgiving sin, he did
 “ put the people from him, and appointed them unto
 “ Christ, saying thus unto them, Behold, yonder is the
 “ Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the
 “ world: even so, as great and as godly a virtue as
 “ FAITH is, yet it PUTTETH US FROM ITSELF, and re-
 “ mitteth or appointeth us UNTO CHRIST, for to have
 “ ONLY BY HIM remission of our sins, or justification.
 “ So that our faith in Christ (as it were) faith unto us
 “ thus, It is not I that take away your sins, but it is
 “ Christ only, and to him only I SEND you for that
 “ purpose; forsaking therein, all your good virtues,
 “ words, thoughts and works, and only putting your
 “ trust in Christ.” *Homily of salvation*, part II. p. 16.

Once more. “ God, of his own mercy, through the
 “ only merits and deservings of his Son Jesus Christ,
 “ doth justify us. Nevertheless, because FAITH doth
 “ *directly send us to Christ*, for remission of our sins; and
 “ that, by *faith*, GIVEN US OF GOD, we EMBRACE the
 “ promise of God’s mercy, and of the remission of our
 “ sins (which thing none other of our virtues or works
 “ properly doth); therefore scripture useth to say, that
 “ *faith*, without works, *doth justify*. And forasmuch
 “ that it is all one sentence in effect, to say, FAITH
 “ WITHOUT WORKS, and ONLY FAITH, doth justify us;
 “ therefore the old, antient fathers of the church, from
 “ time to time, have uttered our justification with this
 “ speech, *only faith justifieth us*: meaning none other
 “ thing than St. *Paul* meant, when he said, faith with-
 “ out works justifieth us. And because all this is brought
 “ to pass, through the only merits and deservings of our
 “ Saviour Christ, and not through *our* merits, or
 “ through the merit of any virtue that we have within
 “ us, or of any work that cometh from us; therefore,
 “ in that respect of merit and deserving, we forsake (as
 “ it were) all together again, faith, works, and all other
 “ virtues. For our own imperfection is so great,
 “ through

“ through the corruption of original sin, that all is im-
 “ perfect that is within us ; faith, charity, hope, dread,
 “ thoughts, words, and works : and therefore not apt
 “ to merit and discern ANY PART of our justification for
 “ us. And this form of speaking use we in the hum-
 “ bling of ourselves to God ; and to give all the glory
 “ to our Saviour Christ, who is best worthy to have it.”

Ibid. part III. p. 17.

’Tis plain, from these testimonies, that, according to the judgment of the church, God does not dishonour his law, nor compromise and patch up matters with justice, by accepting of *faith*, in the room of perfect obedience, and imputing that for righteousness, which is not such : the office of *faith*, in the affair of justification, being to *send us directly*, or transmit us *through* and *from* itself, *to Christ* : and to *embrace* God’s promises of mercy in Him.

It may here be enquired, since neither *faith* NOR *works* are the *matter of justification* ; what is it, for the sake of which, God does justify ? Our church answers, with scripture, THE RIGHTEOUSNESS AND BLOODSHEDDING OF CHRIST ALONE. “ God sent his only Son, our
 “ Saviour Jesus Christ, into this world, TO FULFILL
 “ THE LAW FOR US ; and, by shedding of his most pre-
 “ cious BLOOD, to make a SACRIFICE and SATISFAC-
 “ TION, or (as it may be called) amends to his Father
 “ for our sins.” Homily of *salvation*, part I. p. 12.

“ With his endless mercy, he joined his most up-
 “ right and equal justice. His great mercy he shewed
 “ unto us, in delivering us from our former captivity,
 “ without requiring of ANY ransom to be paid, or
 “ *amends* to be made, UPON OUR PARTS ; which thing
 “ *by us* had been impossible to be done. And whereas
 “ it lay not in us that to do, he provided a ransom for
 “ us, that was the most precious body and blood of
 “ his own most dear and best beloved son Jesus Christ ;
 “ who, BESIDES this *ransom*, FULFILLED THE LAW
 “ FOR US PERFECTLY. And so the justice of God and
 “ his mercy did embrace together, and fulfilled the
 “ mystery

“ mystery of our redemption.—Christ is the end of
 “ the law unto RIGHTEOUSNESS, to every one that be-
 “ lieveth.” *Ibid.* p. 13.

“ The Apostle toucheth three things specially,
 “ which must go together in our justification. Upon
 “ God’s part, his great MERCY AND GRACE. Upon
 “ Christ’s part, justice; that is, the SATISFACTION OF
 “ God’s JUSTICE, or the price of our redemption, by
 “ the offering of his body, and the shedding of his
 “ blood; together with FULFILLING OF THE LAW per-
 “ fectly and thoroughly. And, upon *our* part, true
 “ and lively FAITH in the merits of Jesus Christ, which
 “ yet is not our’s, but by God’s working in us.” *Ibid.*

“ It pleased our heavenly Father, of his infinite
 “ mercy, without any our desert or deserving, to pre-
 “ pare for us the most precious jewels of Christ’s body
 “ and blood, whereby our RANSOM might be FULLY
 “ PAID, the LAW FULFILLED, and his JUSTICE FULLY
 “ SATISFYED. So that CHRIST is now THE
 “ RIGHTEOUSNESS OF ALL THEM THAT TRULY DO BE-
 “ LIEVE IN HIM. He for them paid their ransom, by
 “ his *death*. HE, FOR THEM, FULFILLED THE LAW IN
 “ HIS LIFE. So that now, IN HIM, and by him,
 “ every true Christian man may be called A FULFILLER
 “ OF THE LAW.” *Ibid.* p. 14.

VI. I shall now proceed to remind you, Sir, of what
 our church asserts, concerning the INFLUENCE AND IN-
 DWELLING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

“ In reading of God’s word, he most profiteth not
 “ always, that is most ready in turning of the book, or
 “ in saying of it without the book: but he that is *most*
 “ *turned into it*; that is MOST INSPIRED WITH THE HO-
 “ LY GHOST; most in his heart and life altered and

* “ Whose mediation” [i. e. the mediation of Christ] “ was so
 “ acceptable to God the Father, through his ABSOLUTE AND PER-
 “ FECT OBEDIENCE, that he took his ACT for a full satisfaction of
 “ all our disobedience and rebellion: whose RIGHTEOUSNESS he
 “ took, to weigh against our sins; whose REDEMPTION he would
 “ have stand against our damnation.” *Third rogation homily*,
 p. 297.

“ changed

“ changed into the thing which he readeth.” First homily *on the knowledge of scripture*, p. 3.

“ He” [Christ] “ speaketh presently unto us in the holy scriptures, to the great and endless comfort of all them that have ANY FEELING of God in them.” First homily *on certain places of scripture*, p. 221.

“ Such is the power of the Holy Ghost to regenerate men, and as it were to bring them forth anew; so that they shall be nothing like the men that they were before. Neither doth he think it sufficient, INWARDLY TO WORK THE SPIRITUAL AND NEW BIRTH of man, unless he do also DWELL AND ABIDE in him.” First homily *for Whitsunday*, p. 280.

“ Unless the Holy Ghost had been always present, governing and preserving the church from the beginning; it could never have sustained so many and great brunts of affliction and persecution, with so little damage and harm, as it hath. And the words of Christ are most plain in this behalf, saying, that the spirit of truth should abide with them for ever; that he would be with them always (he meaneth, by grace, virtue, and power), even to the world’s end. Also, in the prayer that he made to his Father, a little before his death, he maketh intercession, not only for himself and his apostles, but indifferently for all them that should believe in him, through their words; that is to wit, for his whole church. Again, St. Paul saith; if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, the same is not his. Also, in the words following, we have received THE SPIRIT OF ADOPTION, whereby we cry, *Abba, father*. Hereby then, it is evident and plain to all men, that the Holy Ghost was given, *not only to the apostles*, but also *to the whole body of Christ’s congregation*; although not in like form and majesty as he came down at the feast of Pentecost.” Second homily *for Whitsunday*, p. 282.

“ God give us grace (good people) to know these things, and to FEEL THEM IN OUR HEARTS. This KNOWLEDGE AND FEELING is not in ourself. By
I “ ourself

“ ourself it is not possible to come by it.—Let us,
 “ therefore, meekly call upon that bountiful spirit,
 “ THE HOLY GHOST, which proceedeth from our Fa-
 “ ther of mercy, and from our mediator Christ, that
 “ he would assist us, and INSPIRE US WITH HIS PRE-
 “ SENCE; that IN HIM we may be able to hear the
 “ goodness of God declared unto us to our salvation.
 “ For, without his LIVELY AND SECRET INSPIRATION,
 “ can we not once so much as speak the name of our
 “ mediator, as St. *Paul* plainly testifyeth: no man can
 “ once name our Lord Jesus Christ, but in the Holy
 “ Ghost *.—St. *Paul* saith, that no man can know
 “ what is of God, but the Spirit of God. As for us,
 “ saith he, we have received, not the spirit of the
 “ world, but the Spirit which is of God; for this pur-
 “ pose, that we might KNOW THE THINGS THAT BE
 “ GIVEN US BY CHRIST.” This leads me,

VII. To consider the sense of our church, with rela-
 tion to the doctrine of ASSURANCE. She tells us, that
 “ The right and true Christian faith is, not only to be-
 “ lieve, that holy scripture, and all the aforesaid articles
 “ of our faith are true; but also to have a SURE TRUST
 “ AND CONFIDENCE in God’s merciful promises, to be
 “ saved from everlasting damnation by Christ: whereof
 “ doth FOLLOW a loving heart to obey his command-
 “ ments.—For, how can a man have this *true faith*,
 “ this SURE TRUST and confidence in God, that, by
 “ the merits of Christ, HIS SINS BE FORGIVEN, and he
 “ RECONCILED TO THE FAVOUR OF GOD, and to be
 “ PARTAKER OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN by Christ,
 “ when he liveth ungodly, and denyeth Christ in his
 “ deeds?” Third homily of *salvation*, p. 18.

“ A quick, or lively faith—is not only the common
 “ belief of the articles of our faith, but it is also a

* 1 Cor. xii. 3. *No man can*, for himself in particular, with an ASSURED and APPROPRIATING faith, and from a real principle of experimental love, call *Jesus* his lord, but by the *Holy Ghost*; whose gracious office it is, to bring Christ and the soul together, in a way of spiritual intercourse and communion.

“ true trust and CONFIDENCE of the mercy of God
“ through our Lord Jesus Christ, and a STEDFAST HOPE
“ of all good things to be received at God’s hand.”

First homily *on faith*, p. 20.

“ They” [the Old Testament saints] “ did not only
“ know God to be the lord, maker, and governor of
“ all men in the world; but also they had a SPECIAL
“ CONFIDENCE AND TRUST, that he was, and * would
“ be THEIR God, THEIR comforter, aider, helper,
“ *maintainer*, and defender. This is the Christian
“ faith which these holy men had, and WE ALSO OUGHT
“ TO HAVE.” Second homily *on faith*, p. 23.

“ Finally he” (St. John) “ concludeth, and sheweth
“ the cause why he wrote this epistle; saying, for this
“ cause have I thus written unto you, THAT YOU MAY
“ KNOW THAT YOU HAVE EVERLASTING LIFE, which do
“ believe in the Son of God.” *Ibid.* p. 24.

“ He that doth consider all these things, and believeth
“ them assuredly, as they are to be believed, even from
“ the bottom of his heart; being established in God in
“ this true faith, having a quiet conscience in Christ,
“ a FIRM HOPE, and ASSURED TRUST in God’s mercy,
“ through the merits of Jesus Christ, to obtain this
“ quietness, rest, and everlasting joy; shall not only
“ be without fear of bodily death, &c.” Third homily
against fear of death, p. 61, 62.

This is meant by what the church calls, the “ EF-
“ FECTUOUS PRESENCE OF HIS HEAVENLY GRACE.”
First homily *of the right use of the church*, p. 94.

“ Then we shall be ASSURED, after this life, to
“ rest in his holy hill, and to dwell in his tabernacle.”

Second homily *of the right use of the church*, p. 102.

* Hence it appears, that, in the judgment of our church, the as-
surance of faith *looks forward* to what *shall be*, as well as regards the
present. The saints, even under the Jewish dispensation, had, ac-
cording to this homily, not only a *special confidence and trust*, that
God was *then* THEIR God; but likewise that he *would be* so still,
and be their *maintainer* in the grace he had given them. But how is
this consistent with the new, Arminian doctrine, of *finally falling from*
grace?

“ By this then, you may well perceive that the only
 “ mean and instrument of salvation, required of our
 “ parts, is FAITH: that is to say, a SURE trust and
 “ confidence in the mercies of God, whereby we per-
 “ suade ourselves that God both HATH and WILL for-
 “ give our sins.” Second homily *on the passion*, p. 260.

“ Thou hast received his body, to endow thee with
 “ everlasting righteousness; to ASSURE THEE OF
 “ EVERLASTING BLISS and life of thy soul.” Homily
on the resurrection, p. 265.

“ The faithful see, hear, and KNOW the favourable
 “ mercies of God sealed, the satisfaction by Christ to-
 “ wards us confirmed, and the REMISSION OF SIN ESTA-
 “ BLISHED. Here they may FEEL wrought, the tran-
 “ quillity of conscience; the increase of faith; the strength-
 “ ening of hope; the large spreading abroad of brotherly
 “ kindness; with many other sundry graces of God.—
 “ Whence you may PERCEIVE AND KNOW, both the
 “ spiritual food of this costly supper, and the HAPPY
 “ TRUSTINGS and effects, that the same doth bring
 “ with it. Now it followeth, to have with this know-
 “ ledge, a sure and constant faith,—that he hath made
 “ upon his cross, a full and sufficient sacrifice for
 “ THEE; a perfect cleansing of THY sins.” First
 homily *on the sacrament*, p. 271, 272.

“ If, after contrition, we FEEL OUR CONSCIENCES AT
 “ PEACE WITH GOD. through remission of our sin, &c.”
 Third *rogation* homily, p. 297.

Intimately connected with the privilege of assurance, is,

VIII. The blessing of FINAL PERSEVERANCE.
Noah, Lot, Abraham, Jacob, David, and Solomon, though
 they committed very flagrant and atrocious offences,
 things (as the Homily expresses it) “ *plainly forbidden*
 “ *by the law of God, and now repugnant to all public ha-*
 “ *nesty;*” yet, the opinion of our church seems to be, that,
 even under such shocking circumstances as these, those
 Jewish Saints were not *totally* fallen from grace. Her
 words are as follow: “ We ought then to learn by them
 “ this profitable lesson; that, if so godly men, as they
 “ were,

“ were, which otherwise felt inwardly God’s Holy Spirit inflaming in their hearts with the fear and love of
 “ God, could not, by their own strength, keep themselves from committing horrible sin, but did so
 “ grievously fall, that, without God’s great mercy, they had perished everlastingly; how much more
 “ then ought we miserable wretches, who have no feeling of God in us at all, continually to fear, not
 “ only that we may fall as they did, but also be *over-*
 “ *come and drowned* in sin, WHICH THEY WERE NOT ? ”

First homily *on certain places of scripture*, p. 224, 225.

Perseverance, in another homily, is represented as *the gift of God*. “ Let us, throughout our whole lives, confess all good things to come of God, of what name or nature soever they be; not of these corruptible things only, whereof I have now last spoken, but much more of all spiritual graces behovable for our soul: without whose goodnets no man is *called* to faith, OR STAYED THEREIN.” Second *rogation* hom. p. 296.

Again. “ St. Peter saith, it is of God’s power that ye be KEPT through faith TO SALVATION. It is of the goodness of God, that we FALTER NOT in our hope unto him.” Third *rogation* hom. p. 297.

The following passages, I should imagine, seem scarcely reconcilable with the doctrine of the total and final amissibility of real grace. “ True faith will shew forth itself, and cannot long be idle: for, as it is written, The just man doth live by his faith; he never sleepeth, nor is idle, when he would wake and be well occupied. And God, by his Prophet *Jeremy*, saith, That he is an happy and blessed man, which hath faith and confidence in God: For he is like a tree set by the water side, and spreadeth his roots abroad towards the moisture, and feareth not heat when it cometh: His leaf will be green, and WILL NOT CEASE to bring forth his fruit: Even so, faithful men (putting away all fear of adversity) will shew forth the fruit of their good works, as occasion is offered to do them.” First homily *on faith*, p. 21.

“ All those, therefore, have great cause to be *full of*
 “ joy, that be *joined* to Christ with true faith, steadfast
 “ hope, and perfect charity; and not to fear death nor
 “ everlasting damnation. For death cannot deprive
 “ them of Jesus Christ, nor any sin can condemn them
 “ that are GRAFTED SURELY in him, who is their only
 “ joy, treasure, and life.” Second homily *against fear*
of death, p. 56.

“ The just man falleth seven times, and *riseth again*.
 “ Though THE GODLY do *fall*, yet they WALK NOT ON
 “ purposely in sin; they stand not still, to CONTINUE
 “ and TARRY in sin; they sit not down like careless
 “ men, without all fear of God’s just punishment for sin:
 “ But, defying sin, THROUGH GOD’S GREAT GRACE and
 “ infinite mercy THEY RISE AGAIN, and fight against
 “ sin.” Second homily *on certain places of scripture*,
 p. 226.

“ Christ Jesus, the prophets, the apostles, all and
 “ the true ministers of his word; yea, every jot and
 “ tittle in the holy scripture, HAVE BEEN, IS, and SHALL
 “ BE FOR EVERMORE, *the favor of life* UNTO ETERNAL
 “ LIFE, unto ALL THOSE whose hearts God hath pu-
 “ rified by true faith.” *Ibid.* p. 228.

“ After the loving kindness of God our Saviour ap-
 “ peared towards mankind, not according to the righte-
 “ ousness that we had done, but according to his great
 “ mercy, he saved us by the fountain of the new-birth,
 “ and by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he
 “ poured upon us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our
 “ Saviour; that we BEING ONCE JUSTIFIED BY HIS
 “ GRACE, should be heirs of ETERNAL LIFE, through
 “ hope and faith in his blood.” Homily *on the nati-*
vity, p. 247.

“ St. Peter thanketh God, the Father of our Lord
 “ Jesus Christ, for his abundant mercy; because he
 “ hath begotten us (saith he) unto a lively hope, by
 “ the resurrection of Jesus Christ from death, to enjoy
 “ an *inheritance immortal*, that *never shall perish*, which
 “ is laid up in heaven FOR THEM THAT BE KEPT

“ BY THE POWER OF GOD through faith.” Homily
on the resurrection, p. 264.

“ He hath ransomed sin, overcome the devil, death,
“ and hell, and hath victoriously gotten the better hand
“ of them all, to make us FREE and SAFE from them.
“ And knowing that we be, by this benefit of his re-
“ surrection, RISEN WITH HIM by our faith, UNTO
“ LIFE EVERLASTING; being in FULL SURETY of our
“ hope, that we shall have our bodies likewise raised
“ from death, to have them glorified in immortality,
“ and joined to his glorious body: having, in the mean
“ while, this HOLY SPIRIT WITHIN OUR HEARTS, as
“ a SEAL and PLEDGE of our EVERLASTING IN-
“ HERITANCE. By whose assistance, we be replenished
“ with all righteousness; by whose power we shall be
“ able to subdue all our evil affections, rising against
“ the pleasure of God.” *Ibid.* p. 265, 266.

“ The faithful have their life, their ABIDING in him;
“ their union, and, as it were, their INCORPORATION
“ with him.” First homily on the sacrament, p. 272.

“ Neither doth he,” [the Holy Ghost] “ think it
“ sufficient inwardly to work the spiritual and new-
“ birth of a man, unless he do also DWELL and
“ ABIDE in him.” First homily for Whitsunday,
p. 280.

“ Very liberal and gentle is the Spirit of wisdom. In
“ his power shall we have sufficient ability to know our
“ duty to God. In him shall we be comforted and
“ couraged to walk in our duty. In him shall we be
“ meet vessels to receive the grace of Almighty God:
“ for it is he that purgeth and purifieth the mind, by
“ his secret working. And he only is present every
“ where by his invisible power, and containeth all things
“ in his dominion. He lighteneth the heart, to con-
“ ceive worthy thoughts of Almighty God: he sitteth
“ in the tongue of man, to stir him to speak his
“ honour. He only ministereth spiritual strength to
“ the powers of our soul and body. To HOLD THE
“ WAY which God had prepared for us, to walk rightly

“ in our journey, we must acknowledge that it is IN
 “ THE POWER OF HIS SPIRIT, which helpeth our infir-
 “ mity.” Third homily for *Rogation week*, p. 299.

So speaks *the Church of England* : and so will she ever speak, while her LITURGY, her ARTICLES, and HOMILIES, stand as they do. THESE are the doctrines, which she holds; THESE, the truths, to which all her clergy have subscribed* : Truths these, which have no more to do with *Methodism* (properly so called), than they have with *Mahometanism*. To our departure from the above principles of the Reformation, are chiefly owing, 1. That the church and churchmen are the scorn of infidels. 2. That so great a part of the *common people* of this land are sunk into such *deplorable ignorance* of divine things, as is unparalleled in any other Protestant country. 3. That our *churches* are, in many places, so empty ; while *dissenting meetings* are generally as *full* as they can hold. The plain, but melancholy truth, is, that, in various parts of this kingdom, multitudes of persons, who are churchmen upon *principle*, are forced to go to *meeting*, in order to hear the doctrines of their own church preached. And, as to the *totally ignorant*, and openly *profane*, they care not whether they attend on any public worship or not. To the same deviation from our established doctrines, we may, 4. Impute, in great measure, the vast and still increasing spread of *infidelity* amongst us. Christianity, *shorn* of its peculiar and distinguishing principles, and reduced to little more than a dry system of Ethics, can take but small hold of mens hearts, and is itself but a better species of *Deism*. Many graceless persons, are yet men of *good sense* : and, when such consider the present state of religion in this country, how is it possible for them not to reason in a manner similar to this† ? “ There is a book, called THE BIBLE, in which such

* Well, therefore, might the House of Commons pass a condemnatory vote concerning *Montague's* book, written in favour of Arminianism ; see *Life of Laud*, p. 148 and 180, with *Laud's Anim.* p. 181.

† See Mr. *Sless* on the Trinity ; pref. p. 10.

“ and

“ and such doctrines are written as with a sun-beam.
 “ There is also an establishment, called THE CHURCH,
 “ which teaches the self-same doctrines, and is the very
 “ echo of that book. This Bible is said, by the clergy,
 “ to be *of divine authority*, and a revelation from God.
 “ And, for the church, they tell us, it is the *best* and
 “ *purest* in the world; and indeed, unless they thought it
 “ so, nothing could justify their solemn *subscription* to
 “ its decisions. Yet, how many of them open their
 “ *mouaths*, and draw their *pens*, against those very de-
 “ cisions to which they have set their *hands*? Can
 “ those of them, who do this, *really believe* the SCRIP-
 “ TURES to be divine, and their CHURCH to be in the
 “ right? Does it not rather look as if religion was no
 “ more than a *state-engine*, on one hand; and a *genteel*
 “ *trade*, on the other?” Such, I more than fear, is the
 conclusion, unhappily inferred, by thousands, from the
 conduct of some, who lift up their heel against the
 church, while they eat her bread; or as Dr. YOUNG
 expresses it, “ *Pluck down the vine, and get drunk with*
 “ *the grapes.*” To the same source may be traced
 the rapid and alarming progress of *Popery* in this king-
 dom. Would we lay the axe to the root of this evil?
 Let us forsake our Arminianism, and come back to the
 doctrines of the Reformation. That these are *calvinistic*,
 has, I think, been fully proved: and, should these
 proofs be deemed insufficient, there are more in reserve.
 A man must draw up a prodigiously large *index expur-*
gatorius to our articles, homilies, and liturgy, before
 he can divest the church of her Calvinism. As long as
 these, in their present form, remain the standards of
 her faith: so long will predestination be an eminent part
 of it. We might more plausibly, with the philosopher
 of old, deny that there is any such thing as *Motion*, than
 deny this glaring, palpable, stare-face truth. Whilst
 the calvinistic doctrines were the language of our *pulpits*,
 as well as of our articles; the REFORMATION made a
 swift and extensive progress. But, ever since our ar-
 ticles and our pulpits have been at variance, the Refor-
 mation

mation has been *at a stand*. At a stand, did I say? I said too little. Protestantism has, ever since, been visibly *on the decline*. Look round ENGLAND, Look round LONDON. Is not Popery gaining ground upon us every day? And no wonder. Arminianism is the basis of it. Figuratively speaking, the Arminian points are *five* of the seven hills, on which the mystic Babylon is built. It gives a true Papist less pain to hear of Pope *Joan*, than of *Predestination*. That I do not affirm things at random, in calling Arminianism the very essence of Popery, will appear from the following short *antithesis*, wherein the doctrines of our own church, and those of *Rome*, respecting some of the articles under debate, are contrasted together, in the very words of each church.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

CHURCH OF ROME.

I. *The godly consideration of predestination, and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons.*

ART. XVII.

II. *The condition of man, after the fall of Adam, is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God.*

ART. X.

III. *We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and*

I. *No man, so long as he liveth in this mortal life, ought so far to presume concerning the hidden mystery of divine predestination, as positively to conclude that he is actually in the number of the predestinate.*

Concil. Trid. Sess. 6. cap. xii.

II. *If any person shall say, that since the fall of Adam, man's free will is lost and extinct, &c. Let him be accursed.*

Ibid. Sess. 6. can. v.

III. *If any person shall say, that men are justified, either by the alone righteousness*

and Saviour Jesus Christ, and NOT for our own works, or deservings. ness of Christ, or by a bare forgiveness of sins. — Let him be accursed.

ART. XI.

Ibid. can. xi.

IV. *That we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.*

ART. XI.

IV. *If any one shall say, that the ungodly is justified by faith only, so as to mean that nothing else is required, &c. Let him be accursed.*

Ibid. can. ix.

V. ART. XIII. *Of works done before justification. Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God:—yea,—we doubt not, but they have the nature of sin.*

V. *If any one shall say, that all the works, done before justification, in what way soever they are done, are actually sins, and deserving of God's displeasure, &c. Let him be accursed.*

Ibid. can. vii.

VI. *Good works, which are the FRUITS of faith, and FOLLOW AFTER justification.*

ART. XII.

VI. *If any man shall say, that justification [justitiam] received is not preserved, and even increased before God, by good works; but that these good works themselves are no more than the FRUITS and EVIDENCES, fructus & signa] of justification already obtained, &c. Let him be accursed.*

Even from this slight survey, must not a man be blind, not to discern that *Calvinism* is the religion of England, and that *Arminianism* is the heresy of Rome;*

* So *Heylin* expressly owns; *Life of Laud*, p. 33. After which he adds, impudently, "so near, &c." p. 36. and wishes for a reconciliation with *Rome*, *ibid*.

yet far be it from me to think, that all, among us, who espouse the Arminian tenets, are *intentional* Papists, or have any affection for Popery, as such. But this I cannot help believing, that Arminianism is the forerunner which *prepares the way* for Romanism, and, if not discarded in time, will, one day, *open the door* to it.

To close all, our *doctrines* are the precious *depositum*, committed, in a particular manner, to the guardianship of us, who have the honour to minister in holy things. How those, who make no scruple to betray this inestimable trust, which they have so solemnly and repeatedly engaged to preserve, can answer it in conscience, must be submitted to God and themselves. For a clergyman to *subscribe* to our articles in the presence of his bishop, and after his admission to a benefice, to *read over* those articles in his church, deliberately, and word by word; and there, in the presence of God, and in the hearing of his own parishioners, publicly to testify his *unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing therein contained*; while he *disbelieves*, and it may be, the same day, contradicts, in the *pulpit*, what he had so lately assented to from the *desk*; is, I believe, a species of guilt, unknown to any Protestant nation but these. I fear, such a clergyman, if such a clergyman is to be found, may take home those awful words to himself, *Thou hast not only lied unto men, but unto God*.

We have had long experience of the sad effects, that have attended that mere ethical way of preaching, which has been in fashion ever since *the restoration*. When that happy event took place, the generality of the clergy, ran so fast and so far from *puritanism*, that they outran the thirty-nine articles*, and lost sight of *the church* itself. "Good works, good works," was the cry of that age, and is the cry of the present. I heartily wish, good works abounded more among us, than they do: but I am certain they never will, 'till they are enforced on *Christian principles*; even the doctrines of grace.

* See *Hume's Hist.* vol. v.

Under a pretence of magnifying good works, we have almost kicked *faith* out of doors : whereas they will always stand or fall together. There can be no good works which do not flow from faith ; and no true faith but what is productive of good works. I appeal to demonstration, the life of argument. Faith is banished, and good works are posting after it as fast as they can. Contempt of gospel doctrines, and neglect of gospel-morals, are inseparable. Taht morality, which does not result from faith, is, (as LUTHER says of *free-will*) no more than *titulus et nomen, sine re*. Faith, according to the united determinations of scripture, and our own church, is the *root* and source of all true obedience. And shall we idly think to render the tree more fruitful, by severing it from its *root* ? or to enlarge the stream by cutting off its communication with the fountain ? When the genuine doctrines of the church of England are restored to her sons ; then, and not till then, will good works flourish and abound.

Veneration and affection for the church of England, gave birth to the preceding pages. I have endeavoured to *rub off* the extraneous varnish, with which, you, Sir, have disguised her ; and to restore her complexion to its native beauty and simplicity. The doctrines which she avows, cannot but appear amiable in the eyes of all her genuine sons : and, upon a nearer view, *Calvinism*, I would hope, is not found to be that *horrid, hideous* thing, which *they* would make it, who first dress up the *Dove* in Raven's plumes, and then cry out, " How *black* she looks ! "

I shall conclude, with apologizing for this freedom : which, however, I should not have taken, had not you first made so free with the church. I have no *interest*, abstracted from HER'S, to promote ; no *resentment*, to gratify ; no *party*, to serve. I never had, to my knowledge, the pleasure of so much as seeing the author of *Pietas Oxoniensis* ; nor have I the least acquaintance with any one of the expelled students.—So far, at least, as the doctrines of the *church*, are concerned, it seems incumbent

incumbent on you to retract what you have done. The ablest lawyers, when they find themselves embarqued in an absolutely indefensible cause, think it no disparagement, but a point of honour, to throw up their briefs. However, as I am addressing myself to a *clergyman*, I shall remind you of a very great man, an ornament to his country, as well as to the church, who, after having long been a zealous *Arminian*, sacrificed his prejudices, submitted to superior evidence, and boldly avowed those CALVINISTIC doctrines, which once he laboured to destroy. You will readily guess, that I mean the justly famous Dr. SOUTH, who, moreover, was like you, *public orator of OXFORD*. After the mention of *such* a name, it can be no insult to Dr. NOWELL, to wish, that *he* may go and do likewise. The doctrines of the church have not been changed, since she happily emerged at the reformation. Religious truths are not, like *lead*, or any other *fusible* metal, to be *melted down*, and thrown into what form we please: but, like their adorable author, are *the same, yesterday, to-day and for ever*. Nor, 'till the *church* changes, should *we*.

You'll excuse my not subjoining my name. Where *Truth* is sought, *Names* are of little account. An arrow, from an unknown hand, may do as much execution, as if the contending parties were acquainted. I shall, therefore, only subscribe myself, with undissembled respect,

Rev. Sir,

Your most obedient

LONDON, Feb.
13, 1769,

and most humble Servant,

C L E R U S.



F I N I S.

